

THE
AMERICAN BC
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW

Under the Direction of
MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS { RT. REV. MGR. JAMES F. LOUGHLIN, D. D.
 { RT. REV. MGR. JAMES P. TURNER, D. D., V. G.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum
veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive
confitentem. S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXXV.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1910.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

PHILADELPHIA :
211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

Entered according to Act of Congress,
in the year 1910,
By P. J. RYAN,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

170567

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE.
Anarchists Again, Senor Ferrer and the—Rev. G. McDermot,	
C. S. P.....	569
Apologetics, Scholastic—Rev. D. A. Dever.....	48
Art, Christianity and—Hugh Thomas.....	267
Battles of Theology, The—Rev. J. B. Ceulemans.....	118
Belloc, Hilaire. The Need for Catholic History.....	590
Bishop Nicolson's Visitation of the Highlands in 1700—Dom	
Odo Blundell, O. S. B.....	595
Black, John, Scottish Dominican Martyr—Rev. R. P. Devas,	
O. P.....	509
Blundell, O. S. B., Dom Odo. Bishop Nicolson's Visitation of	
the Highlands in 1700.....	595
Brazil, Glimpses of—Rev. Charles W. Currier, Ph. D.....	468
Celtic Genius, A Side of—Rev. Michael Earls, S. J.....	239
Ceulemans, Rev. J. B. The Battles of Theology.....	118
Charles II., Irish Catholics in the Reign of—W. F. Dennehy.....	279, 533
Christianity and Art—Hugh Thomas.....	267
Church in Scotland Under the Penal Laws, The—J. F. Schol-	
field.....	292
Contract as the Origin of Government—Rev. John Rick-	
aby, S. J.....	548, 624
Currier, Ph. D.—Rev. Charles W. Glimpses of Brazil.....	468
Currier, Ph. D.—Rev. Charles W. Spanish-American Inde-	
pendence.....	I
Dale, Darley. The Diary of Vadstena.....	252
Dante's Troubadours, One of—M. A. Dunne.....	606
de Courson, Comtesse. A Marquise of the Old Regime.....	445
Dennehy, William F. Irish Catholics in the Reign of Charles	
II.....	279, 533
Devas, O. P., Rev. R. P. John Black, Scottish Dominican	
Martyr.....	509
Dever, Ph. D.—Rev. Daniel A. Scholastic Apologetics.....	48

	PAGE.
Diary of Vadstena, The—Darley Dale.....	252
Dunne, M. A. One of Dante's Troubadours.....	606
Earls, S. J., Rev. Michael. A Side of Celtic Genius.....	239
Earls, S. J., Rev. Michael. Roisin Dubh	633
Education, How the Battle of Jena Affected Prussian—J. J. O'Shea	738
Encyclicals—St. Charles Borromeo	377
The Sillon.....	693
Modernism.....	712
First Holy Communion.....	732
Evolution, Father Wassman on—Rev. S. FitzSimons.....	12
England Became Protestant, How—Francis W. Grey, Litt. D..	77
Faith, Scientists and—James J. Walsh, M. D.....	216
Father Wassman on Evolution—Rev. S. FitzSimons.....	12
Ferrer and the Anarchists Again, Senor—Rev. G. McDermot, C. S. P.....	569
FitzSimons, Rev. Simon—Father Wassman on Evolution....	12
FitzSimons, Rev. Simon. Studies in Kant.....	665
French Revolution, Pius VII. and the—Donat Samp- son.....	130, 413, 637
Gaelic Revival Pioneers, Some—John J. O'Shea.....	173
Ganss, Rev. H. G. Was Luther's Father a Homicide?.....	163
Glimpses of Brazil—Rev. Charles W. Currier, Ph. D.....	468
Government, Contract as the Origin of—Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.....	548, 624
Grey, Litt. D., Francis W. How England Became Protestant	77
Grey, Litt. D., Francis W. Some Factors in the Oxford Movement.....	193
History, The Need for Catholic—Hilaire Belloc.....	590
How England Became Protestant—Francis W. Grey, Litt. D..	77
How the Battle of Jena Affected Prussian Education—J. J. O'Shea.....	738
Interesting Centenary, An—R. F. O'Connor.....	479
Irish Catholics in the Reign of Charles II.—William F. Den- nehy.....	279, 533
Irony of Fate as Beheld in Madagascar, The—John J. O'Shea.	335

Is There Any Such Thing as Essential Right and Wrong?—	
Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.....	246
Jesuit, A Typical—R. F. O'Connor.....	94
Kant, Studies in—Rev. S. FitzSimons.....	665
Luther's Father a Homicide? Was—Rev. H. G. Ganss.....	163
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. Senor Ferrer and the	
Anarchists Again.....	569
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. Sir Robert Anderson's	
Parnellism and Crime.....	320
Madagascar, The Irony of Fate as Beheld in—John J. O'Shea.	335
Marquise of the Old Regime, A—Comtesse de Courson.....	445
Need for Catholic History, The—Hilaire Belloc.....	590
O'Brien, Joseph L.—John Bannister Tabb, Poet.....	355
O'Connor, R. F.—An Interesting Centenary.....	479
O'Connor, R. F.—A Typical Jesuit.....	94
One of Dante's Troubadours—M. A. Dunne.....	606
O'Shea, John J.—Some Gaelic Revival Pioneers.....	173
O'Shea, John J.—The Irony of Fate as Beheld in Madagascar	335
O'Shea, John J.—The Periodicity of Anti-Catholic Calumnies.	496
Oxford Movement, Some Factors in the—Francis W. Grey...	193
Parable of "The Laborers in the Vineyard," The—Rev. Hugh	
Pope, O. P.....	309
Parnellism and Crime, Sir Robert Anderson's—Rev. G. Mc-	
Dermot, C. S. P.....	320
Penal Laws, The Church in Scotland Under the—J. F. Schol-	
field.....	293
Periodicity of Anti-Catholic Calumnies—John J. O'Shea.....	496
Pius VII. and the French Revolution—Donat Sampson	130, 413, 637
Pope, O. P., Rev. Hugh—The Parable of the Laborers in the	
Vineyard.....	309
Protestant, How England Became—Francis W. Grey, Litt. D..	77
Rickaby, S. J., Rev. John—Is There Any Such Thing as Es-	
sential Right and Wrong?.....	246
Rickaby, S. J., Rev. John—Contract as the Origin of Gov-	
ernment.....	548, 624
Roisin Dubh—Rev. Michael Earls, S. J.....	633

	PAGE.
Sampson, Donat—Pius VII. and the French Revolution	130, 413, 637
Scholastic Apologetics—Rev. Daniel A. Dever.....	48
Scholfield, J. Faber—The Church in Scotland Under the Penal Laws	292
Scientists and Faith—James J. Walsh, M. D.....	216
Scotland Under the Penal Laws, The Church in—J. F. Schol- field.....	292
Senor Ferrer and the Anarchists Again—Rev. G. McDermot, C. S. P.....	569
Side of Celtic Genius, A—Rev. Michael Earls, S. J.....	239
Sir Robert Anderson's "Parnellism and Crime"—Rev. G. Mc- Dermot, C. S. P.....	320
Some Factors in the Oxford Movement—Francis W. Grey....	193
Some Gaelic Revival Pioneers—John J. O'Shea.....	173
Studies in Kant—Rev. S. FitzSimons.....	665
Spanish-American Independence—Rev. C. W. Currier, Ph. D..	1
Tabb, John Bannister, Poet—Joseph L. O'Brien.....	355
Theology, The Battles of—Rev. J. B. Ceulemans.....	118
Thomas, Hugh—Christianity and Art.....	267
Typical Jesuit, A—R. F. O'Connor.....	94
Vadstena, The Diary of—Darley Dale.....	252
Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., James J.—Scientists and Faith.....	216
Was Luther's Father a Homicide?—Rev. H. G. Ganss.....	163
Wassman on Evolution, Father—Rev. S. FitzSimons.....	12

BOOKS REVIEWED.

Apologetique Vivante—Abt	375
Blessed Mary of the Angels—O'Neill.....	368
Brahmanisme—Poussin	376
Catholic Encyclopaedia	186, 559
Christian Pedagogy—Halpin	189

Comment il faut Prier—Martin.....	760
Denys d'Alexandries—Burel	568
De Scriptura Sacra—Bainvel	192
Development of Religion—King.....	564
Difesa del Cristianesimo—France.....	757
Enchiridion Historiae Ecclesiasticae—Albers.....	373
Episode de la Fin de Paganisme—de Labriolle.....	758
Epitres de Saint Paul—Toussaint.....	191
Freiheit der Wissenschaft—Donat	190
Gerson Traite du Devoir—Saubin.....	374
Heavenwards—Mother Loyola	760
Histoire de Saint Francois de Borgia—Suau.....	375
Histoire Generale de l'Eglise—Mourret.....	560
History of the American College—Brann.....	373
History of the Catholic Church in the XIX. Century—McCaffrey.....	565
History of the United States for Schools—Forman.....	567
Idees Morales de Madame de Stael—Sourlay.....	757
Julienne de Norwich—Meunier	562
Lecons de Philosophie Sociale—Schwalm.....	753
L'Eglise Georgienne—Tamarati	566
L'Enseignement Catholique—Baudrillart	755
L'Etat Moderne et la Neutralite Scolaire—Fonsegrieve.....	759
Life of Saint Clare—Robinson.....	366
Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages—Mann.....	370
Missale Romanum	374, 567
Mission de Saint Benoit—Newman.....	568
Notre Vie Surnaturelle—de Smedt	372
Philosophie Minerale—de Lapparent	759
Porfirio Diaz—Godoy	371
Positivisme Chretien—Godard	755
Prim und Complet—Gihl.....	376
Principles of Pragmatism—Bawden	558
Religion de l'Ancienne Egypte—Virey.....	756
Resurrection de Jesus—Mangenot	752
Saint Ignatius—Thompson	563
St. Vincent de Paul and the Vincentians—Boyle.....	365

	PAGE.
Supreme Problem—Raupert	369
Theology of the Sacraments—Puorrat.....	364
Valeur Sociale de l'Evangile—Garriguet.....	187
Verite du Catholicisme—Bricout.....	754

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXV.—JANUARY, 1910—No. 137.

SPANISH-AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE.

IN THE MONTH of May, the Argentine Republic will celebrate the centennial anniversary of its independence, Mexico will follow in September, and throughout Spanish America, the echoes will ring of universal rejoicing, and the memories, bitter and sweet, of 1810 will return. In 1810, Spain had ruled for three hundred and eighteen years in America. Her vast dominions were governed in the name of the Spanish monarchs by the Viceroys of Mexico, Peru, New Granada and Buenos Ayres, and by officers of inferior rank, known as captains-general. None disputed her authority, though occasionally, a discerning eye might have observed ominous signs of the coming storm, and influences were at work which would overthrow her empire.

In 1730, there had been a rising at Cochabamba, in Peru, under the Indian, Alejo Calatayud. One of the causes of discontent was that Americans were ignored in the distribution of offices. This complaint cropped up, again and again, from the sixteenth century down, until, in 1889, Spain lost her last possessions in America.

This rising in Peru was the first cry for liberty; it came to nothing. The time for independence was not ripe. Calatayud triumphed over the Spaniards, but he tried to compromise with them. He entered into negotiations, a compact was made, he laid down his arms, and he lost his life in consequence.

In 1780, the Inca, José Gabriel Tupac Amaru, again roused the country to rebellion. Three years of struggle followed, but the

capture of the chief, and his cruel execution put an end to it.

The year after, in 1781, a revolution broke out in New Granada which was successful in so far, as it wrested several privileges from the dominant party.

Nearly thirty years more were to pass before the great rebellion would sweep over Spanish America that was to annihilate Spanish rule on the Western Continent.

In the meantime, great changes had taken place in Europe. The French revolution had triumphed, with a reign of terror greater than that of Sylla in ancient Rome. It came like a whirlwind, and it passed, leaving the despotism of Bonaparte behind; but its more conservative principles spread over the world, and reacted on Spanish America. In Spain, the Bourbons had fallen, too, and Napoleon, who was distributing the thrones of Europe among his kindred, sent his brother, Joseph, to Madrid. But the proud Spaniard who had accepted the Hapsburgers and the Bourbons, because their blood was mingled with that of Castile and Aragon, would have none of the Corsican *parvenu*.

In America, also, great changes had occurred. The British colonies, lying between Spanish America and Canada, had cast off the yoke of the mother country and declared themselves free. There were points of similarity between the British and Spanish colonies, but there were, also, vast differences. Both were dependencies of the crown, and governed by its representatives; in both, the various governments were independent of each other, though united by a common tie of language and blood. But here the likeness ceased. The dependencies of Spain knew nothing of that spirit of liberty that characterized the American colonies. They had no popular representation; the paternal government of the House of Austria, and later of Bourbon, treated them as children, and with the exception of a few spasmodic insurrections, they bowed their heads to every royal decree. There was no such thing as freedom of speech, or of the press; yet they hesitated not to petition the crown when there were grievances to be redressed. In North America, civilization was in its infancy, the settlers were still doing battle with the wilderness, the Indian was the white man's enemy, and the soil was reeking with the blood, shed in savage warfare, or against the French. The colonies possessed no literature worth mentioning, few schools, and fewer centres of higher learning, and, consequently, no men eminent for science and letters. They were content to extract with painful labor the fruits of the soil, to manage their domestic affairs, and to muster their raw militia when the occasion required it.

It was not thus in Spanish America which had reached a high degree of civilization. With the exception of the fierce Araucanians in Chili, and some remote tribes, the Indian races had been conquered and, more or less, Christianized with a certain degree of civilization. Colleges and schools for the Indians, as well as for the Creoles, had existed since the sixteenth century. There were flourishing universities in Mexico, in Peru, in New Granada, in Ecuador, in Chili, in the regions of the La Plata, and in Cuba. Education was, to a great extent, in the hands of ecclesiastics, though it had received a severe blow by the suppression of the Jesuits, the great educators of Spanish America. At this particular time, there was a re-awakening of the natural sciences, especially in Bogota, where men, like Mutiz and Caldas, were forming a new generation of scientists in the famous College *del Rosario*. Literature which had been lulled for a time, was beginning to flourish again, and Spanish America might boast of a host of writers from the sixteenth century down.

For a long time, French literature had been invading Spain and its colonies, the accession of a French dynasty in the eighteenth century serving to increase this influence from across the Pyrenees. This was the period when the encyclopædists were undermining the bases of Christian faith, and sowing the seed which was to grow into the Reign of Terror. Neither the Inquisition, nor its adjunct, the censorship of books, might avail to prevent the principles of the "philosophers" from penetrating among the children of Iberia, whether at home or beyond the seas. When the fruit of the tree of knowledge had been eaten there was, quite naturally, awakened an unconscious thirst for liberty. Together with this, the germ was laid in both hemispheres of a spirit adverse to Christianity. This lay for a long time concealed. The movement for liberty in Spain and its colonies was, unlike in France, not at all inimical to the Church. Men, animated by the encyclopædic spirit, were forced to abide their time. The people were not ripe for a revolution either against the tiara or the crown. Still the time had come for a revolution of some kind. Despotism had almost spent itself, and Spaniards in whose breast the ancient instinct of freedom had never been extinguished, were loath to exchange one form of despotism for another, that of the Bourbons which they had lovingly endured, for that of the invader and upstart Bonaparte. Hence the Spanish revolution which placed the kingdom under a regency, and produced the constitution of Cadiz, was not a rebellion against the Bourbon princes whose abdication was forced by Napoleon; but an opposition to the French. It was democratic in spirit, yet Catholic in tone.

In America, where the growing young Republic of the United States furnished an object lesson, the Fall of the Bourbons served as an occasion for the outbreak which spread so rapidly over the whole continent. There was, at first, no apparent wish to cast off the yoke of the Spanish monarch, the descendant of Philip V. and, in the female line, of the old Gothic kings. But the people of Spanish America who threw themselves into revolution refused to accept either Bonaparte, or the Regency of Cadiz in the appointment of which they had no voice. When, finally, Napoleon had been overthrown, and the old absolutist regime returned with the legitimate king, Ferdinand VII., it was too late. The flames of revolution had spread over the whole of Spanish America, and they could not be extinguished except by torrents of blood. But I anticipate.

In the beginning of 1810, the colonies were still loyal to the mother country. But the time had come; and a leader was needed. He appeared in the person of Simon Bolivar, then twenty-seven years old. Since he had been in France, at the time when Bonaparte was crowned emperor of the French, the idea of emancipating his country had taken possession of his mind. A dark shadow had recently fallen upon him, in the loss of his young wife, a loss that destroyed the domestic peace and happiness which he had enjoyed for so brief a period. He had sought distraction in travel, and had just returned home, when an old friend of his, Vicente Emparan, was appointed captain general of Venezuela, and confirmed by the *Junta* in Spain which had assumed the government during the interregnum. The captain-general was decided to force the recognition of the new government. The voice of Bolivar arose in opposition, and, suddenly, on April 19, the revolution broke out in Caracas. Less than a month had passed when Buenos Ayres declared its independence, and a revolution was in progress, under a *junta*, or provisional government. Thus did the 25th of May become the Argentine "Fourth of July."

About the same period, the revolutionary spirit was rife in Colombia, and the *junta* at Santa Fé de Bogota was paving the way for the independence of the country which was to be attained under the leadership of Bolivar. It is, indeed, surprising to behold how, in spite of the isolation of the colonies, the revolution had spread. Within a very brief period, Peru, Bolivia and Chili were in flames, as well as Venezuela, New Granada and Argentina.

In Mexico, the same opposition to the Cortes existed, and a secret conspiracy was formed to convoke a congress which should govern in the name of Ferdinand VII. This, however, was nipped in the bud. A second conspiracy, in which the famous Hidalgo,

parish priest of Dolores, and Allende were prominent, was, also, discovered, but Hidalgo was too quick for the authorities. On September 16th, he gave the famous "Grito de Dolores," and the flames of revolution broke forth. From now on, the soil of Spanish America was to be soaked with blood.

The revolution, though it broke out simultaneously in all the Spanish possessions, was to be continued in two separate grand divisions, in South America, where Bolivar was the principal figure, and in Mexico.

To write a history of Spanish America is to write of a number of independent states, the vicissitudes of which are varied, although in the fight against the common foes all of the South American countries, hitherto subject to Spanish rule, co-operated.

As in the history of all revolutions, especially when Spaniards are the principal actors, we find great deeds of heroism; but, also, acts of blood curdling cruelty on both sides. The Spaniard is an extremist; he is tremendous in his good and in his evil qualities. His is the choleric temperament, the temperament that makes great men in every walk of life. If he takes to religion, he becomes a mystic or a saint; if to war, he may be a military genius; but when the honor of his country is concerned, he will walk roughshod over his enemies. If he is in authority, and he inflicts punishment, no sentimental fancy will cause him to swerve from his purpose, and he will strike with gauntleted hand. As a reformer he fears no obstacle, and, like Las Casas, he will spare no opponent.

Hence it is that we find so many heroic names in the annals of Spain and its colonies, though many of them are stained by the blood of victims. We cannot but admire the bravery, the intrepidity, the indomitable and all-conquering perseverance of a Cortes or a Pizarro. Yet, no amount of admiration for their deeds of valor can make us forget the execution of a Guatemotzin, on the one hand, or the sacrifice of the unfortunate Atahualpa, on the other. The same country that produces the lovable figure of a Cabeza de Vaca, or of the wise Gasca, gives us, also, a Nero, like Aguirre. Spain is the land of contrasts. Its transparent atmosphere, its fair sky, its touches of unparalleled landscape are coupled with treeless and arid plains. Thus we find among Spaniards heroic virtue and heroic vice; the most beautiful and the most repellant qualities. In the Spanish-American revolution, the descendants of Spaniards were fighting their brothers from the land of their ancestors. The same heroic and the same fierce qualities meet on the battlefield in deadly embrace, producing that greatest horror of civil warfare, a fight to the death, without quarter.

As we begin to analyze these qualities, some great names of great men arise before us. In South America the most prominent are Bolivar, Sucre, San Martin and O'Higgins. With these names the struggle of South America for liberty is inseparably connected. The most striking figure is that of Simon Bolivar. We find the name of Bolivar figuring in old colonial days in the history of Spanish America, but it was reserved to the "Libertador" to immortalize it. A native of Caracas, he raised the standard of revolt in his country, and the *Junta* of Venezuela gave him the rank of colonel. Of war he knew nothing; and the only military experience he had, was what he had acquired as captain of the militia in the valleys of Aragua. His first act in the new drama was a diplomatic one. Sent to England to announce the political change that had come into the government of Venezuela, he obtained from the British Cabinet the assurance that Great Britain would not intervene in the affairs of South America, provided no alliance should be formed with France. After this diplomatic victory, he returned home. Independence was declared July 5, 1811. Thenceforth Bolivar was to be the leading spirit in the revolution. Venezuela and New Granada were the first theatre of his military exploits, the Republic of Colombia the outcome of his victories. In the meantime, Peru was struggling for liberty. Bolivar hastened to assist her. The fields of Junin and Ayacucho established a new republic which alone would suffice to preserve the name of its liberator from oblivion, and Bolivia took its place among the republics of America.

Five of the South American republics owe their independence to Bolivar, namely, Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia. And yet, like so many other great men, Bolivar had to suffer from ingratitude, and the shafts of calumny were hurled at him. But posterity has placed him on a pedestal, and his name is in honor throughout the whole of South America. Bolivar died at Santa Marta in 1830.

Antonio José de Sucre was, like Bolivar, a Venezuelan by birth. From 1813, when Bolivar entered Caracas, until death separated them, these two men were united by ties of friendship that nothing could sever, and the life of the one is closely linked to that of the other. From the first struggle in 1813, until the decisive victory of Ayacucho, they fought side by side, Bolivar with his eagle eye detecting the points where victory awaited the patriots, and Sucre, ever active, organizing, eliminating obstacles, and paving the way to triumphs. At Ayacucho, on August 6, 1824, the victory was gained that decided the fate of South America, the most brilliant victory ever gained in Spanish America. Five thousand seven hundred

patriots fought against nine thousand three hundred royalists. The enemy left three thousand on the field of battle, and the viceroy of Peru was taken prisoner. Sucre was made president for life of Bolivia; but alas; the long series of bloody revolutions that have stained the annals of Spanish America soon began. In one of these Sucre was wounded. Resigning the presidency of a country he had tried in vain to benefit, he returned to Venezuela in 1828, to fall soon after, the victim of an assassin, and to die in the same year as his friend Bolivar. Sucre is regarded as one of the most beautiful characters in the revolution of the colonies of Spain in America, and one whose glory is most free from stain. As a military man we behold in him the conqueror, but intestine strife in a country he had freed was too much for him. Ruinous ambition and perverse passions blocked his way. Leaving the country of his adoption for that of his birth, he asked as reward for his services that his work should not be ruined, and he begged Bolivia to preserve her independence.

Second to Bolivar in importance in the Spanish-American revolution, and the greatest figure in the struggle for Argentine independence, is General José de San Martin. He was born in Argentina in 1778, and in his youth he served in the armies of Spain against the French invasion of the Peninsula. Unlike Bolivar, he had the benefit of a military training, having reached the rank of colonel when the revolution broke out in America. Abandoning the splendid career that lay before him in Spain, he hastened across the Atlantic to offer his services to his country. The newly constituted Argentine government placed the organization of the army in his hands. After a few victories in Argentina and Upper Peru, he formed the Army of the Andes, with which he crossed a mountain range greater than that over which Hannibal and Napoleon had led their hosts, and carried his victorious banner from Chili to the Equatorial regions. At the battle of Chacabuco he established the independence of Chili, and, with the co-operation of O'Higgins, he marched into Peru. He entered Lima in triumph, and, on July 29, 1821, Peru declared its independence, with San Martin as president, bearing the title of Protector. In the meantime Bolivar had accomplished the independence of New Granada, and San Martin, marching northward, met the "Liberator" at Guayaquil. The result of the conference was that San Martin left the consummation of Peruvian independence, with a portion of his troops that afterward figured at Junin and Ayacucho, to Bolivar. The career of this great man ends gloriously, for he took no part in the subsequent imbroglios of Latin America. Retiring to private life, he went to France and

ended his days in peace at Boulogne, on August 17, 1850. He will always be remembered as one of the greatest pioneers of Spanish-American independence.

Bernard O'Higgins is the great figure in the history of the Chilean war for freedom. His father, Ambrose, was an Irishman in the service of Spain, who reached such eminence that he governed Chili as Captain-General, and he was later appointed Viceroy of Peru. The younger O'Higgins was a born Spanish-American, and on his mother's side of Spanish descent. After completing his education in England, he was on his way home through Spain, when he became intimate with some gentlemen from beyond the seas who were then laying their plans for the independence of their country, plans into which the young man heartily entered. On his arrival in Chili he found the country in arms, and he at once entered its service, with the title of Colonel of the Militia of Laja. It was not long before he was general of the army. After the first reverses he took refuge in Argentina, where he joined San Martin, with whom he returned to Chili in 1817. At the battle of Chacabuco it was O'Higgins who decided the day in favor of the patriots. From 1817 to 1823 he was at the head of affairs in Chili, when, obedient to a popular demand, he resigned and retired to Peru, where he died in 1842. His career had been short but brilliant. Like San Martin, he had given liberty to his country, and after that his work was done.

It is striking that the men who gave liberty to the Spanish colonies had either little influence in their government when the goal had been reached, or they met with ingratitude. Bolivar first, then San Martin, Sucre, O'Higgins, and finally Iturbide, all contributed to the independence of their respective countries, but none reaped any substantial or lasting benefits for himself. Such is often the fate of those who have molded the destiny of nations.

During all these years of South American conflict, Mexico had been in the throes of insurrection, with varying fortunes. After an ephemeral success, in which the first spark of the revolution burst into a flame which might have become a conflagration had the revolutionaries been better organized, it seemed crushed for the moment. Hidalgo, followed up by the ecclesiastical and military authorities, was degraded and shot on August 1, 1811. It had again been proven that discipline is better than numbers, and that one of the great errors of military leaders is not to follow up their victories.

Morelos, a priest like Hidalgo, and his pupil in the college of St. Nicolas at Valladolid, kept up the fight with success until 1815, when the tide turned against him. The famous Iturbide was then

fighting for Spain, and gave the first blow to the insurgents. Morelos was captured and, like Hidalgo, degraded and shot on December 22, 1815.

The fight still went on, however, and Vicente Guerrero kept it up successfully, beating the Spaniards at many points, until 1821, when Augustin de Iturbide appears upon the scene as the decisive force. Until then Iturbide had been fighting the patriots, but when the new constitution had been proclaimed in Spain he decided to throw his influence into the scales for Mexican independence. He knew thoroughly the condition of the country, and he managed by degrees to turn public opinion to his favor. Marching southward, ostensibly to fight Guerrero, he invited that redoubtable chief to a conference, with the result that Guerrero accepted his plan, with the three guarantees of *union*, *religion* and *independence*. It was not long before the whole country declared for Iturbide.

The new viceroy, O'Donohue, wishing to secure, if possible, the Mexican throne for Ferdinand VII., or at least one of the royal family, met Iturbide, entered into negotiations with him, and capitulated. The independence of Mexico was now assured, and the "Liberator" entered the capital triumphantly at the head of 16,000 men, on September 27, 1821. Now begin the series of vicissitudes through which the country had to pass for long years, until the downfall of poor Maximilian. The short-lived empire of the unfortunate Iturbide, the feuds of factions in which Freemasonry exercised such influence, the quarrels between the York and Scottish rites, the rise and fall of presidents and dictators, and the interference of foreign nations, give us the history of distracted Mexico until late in the nineteenth century. In fact, the entire history of Spanish America is reeking with blood, shed in revolutions.

A striking feature in the war for independence is the part that ecclesiastics took in it. While the conservative element of the clergy may be said to have adhered to the cause of the mother country, there were a number of priests who favored independence, some of whom actually fought for it. In Mexico, as we have seen, Hidalgo and Morelos were priests who became military officers and led their armies into battle. They figure among the foremost leaders in the revolution to which Hidalgo gave the signal.

In Argentina we find the patriot priest, Cecilio Tagle, who paid for his patriotism in the prisons of the inquisition. Chili gives us the name of Father Buenaventura Aranguiz, a learned Franciscan and a virtuous religious, who, being provincial of his order, was deposed by a Spanish general, Ossorio, and made to suffer for his patriotic sentiments. A confrère in the Franciscan order, country-

man and fellow-patriot of Father Aranguiz, was Juan Antonio Bauza. He too occupied the position of provincial in his order. At a later period, becoming secularized, he died canon of the Cathedral of Santiago.

As we look back over the past century, we cannot but feel pity with the struggling republics of Spanish America. Republicanism with them has been an experiment that has cost them dearly. Castelar said in Spain, long ago, after having failed as a republican president, that it was impossible to have a republic without republicans. Therein, perhaps, lies the reason of the comparative failure of the Spanish republics. Accustomed to an absolute form of government in which they had no voice, the Spanish provinces were hardly ripe for a republican form of government; hence the frequency of dictatorial rule that we observe in them. Their theories were excellent, but the practice was a disastrous failure, and recourse was too often had to the sword. However, they have learned a bitter lesson, which I think is not lost, and the larger republics, like Mexico, Argentina and Chili, are on the highroad to prosperity. The tide of European immigration has for some time been running southward, and some of the most important cities of the western hemisphere, like Buenos Ayres and Santiago, are in South America. The mineral and agricultural resources of the half of this great continent will go on increasing its commerce, and there is no doubt that, from a material standpoint, a great future lies before South America. Intellectually, the better class of the population has reached a high standard, and I have no hesitation in saying that the literature of Spanish America is in some respects in advance of ours. Considering the difficulties writers have had to contend with, this is no small credit. A better acquaintance with our southern neighbors will raise them in our estimation.

As to religion, it is in Spanish America as it has been in every country, as it is with individuals. There are lights and shadows, fluctuations between fervor and tepidity, periods of increase and periods of decrease. In the early colonization period some of the best souls and some of the most desperate characters were coming to America. Cervantes regarded it as the dumping ground of all that was bad in Spain. The correspondence of the early friars shows what a struggle they had against their own countrymen, and histories of the period, like that of Santa Fe de Bogota, by Juan Rodriguez Fresle, exhibit human nature with its bright and with its shadow side, as it always has been, as it ever will be. But, in the colonization period, religion was upheld by authority—that of the

state—while the inquisition, with an iron hand, repressed anything that savored of infidelity.

In the beginning, the religious were the salt of the earth, the mainstay of virtue, and the dike against the vices of the *conquistadores*. However, considering the weakness of human nature and the materialism of the New World, it is not at all surprising that, here and there, the salt of the earth should have become corrupted, and that, sometimes, material interests should have weighed more with ecclesiastics than spiritual. Yet all through the history of Spanish America, in its colonial period as well as in that of independence, I find innumerable names of ecclesiastics, secular and regular, bishops and priests, who shone as bright lights by their learning, and gave great edification by the holiness of their life.

When the colonies had cast off the yoke, it was quite natural that the irreligious element, aided by secret societies, should come to the front. Forces that made for evil, which thus far had been violently repressed, reacted with untrammelled license, while too often they were aided by a state inimical to religion. Yet, with all this, virtue survived and even flourished. It must further be remarked that the same conditions did not prevail in all republics, and that, side by side with the liberal element, adverse to religion, there is a conservative one, upholding the Church and its influence.

With the return of quiet, and the diminution of the revolutionary spirit, as well as the infusion of new blood, it is quite likely that the next era will witness a religious revival that will keep pace with the advance in material prosperity.

The coming summer, which is the winter in the southern hemisphere, Argentina will inaugurate a series of celebrations to commemorate its independence. It is quite likely that many governments, among them our own, will send representatives to share in the rejoicing. A feature of the occasion will be the meeting of various learned congresses, such as that of the *Americanists*, and other international reunions. These will bring together a number of scholars from all parts of the world. The Seventeenth International Congress of Americanists will be the first to meet below the Equator. Contrary to its antecedents, the congress will meet twice in one year, as another will be held in Mexico in September.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

Washington, D. C.

FATHER WASMANN ON EVOLUTION.

IT IS not a little curious to find that when the English-speaking world had about settled down to the very sane conclusion that the theory of evolution was nothing more than a weariness to the spirit and a burden to the flesh, and that Darwinism had become an intolerable bore, over in the proud city of Berlin the fires of controversy are still raging as fiercely as ever and the quarrels of the schools are at white heat in the very capital of that land that aspires to be known as the "Nation of Thinkers."

The reason, of course, is not far to seek, and may be summed up in two words—Ernest Haeckel. Haeckel has long been known as one of the fiercest exponents of Darwinism. He is the German champion of materialistic evolution. Facts may fail him, but his imagination is ever furnished with a ready supply. No one among the original expounders of the famous hypothesis seems to have taken him at all seriously. Its great English-speaking chiefs were wont to smile benignantly on his extravagances of statement. The extraordinary proofs brought forward from time to time by the preposterous Jena professor were regarded with amusement and wonder rather than with anger or alarm; and it is now somewhat surprising to find his countrymen in his old age taking him seriously as an exponent of the moribund hypothesis. But that this is so is beyond question, and the most convincing proof of the strange fact is a somewhat curious volume that comes to us all the way from Berlin, entitled "The Problem of Evolution, by Erich Wasmann, S. J."

It would appear that Father Wasmann had already published a book on "Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution." In a series of lectures delivered at Berlin by the Jena professor, he frequently referred to Father Wasmann's book. Indeed, Father Wasmann tells us in the preface to his recent book that Professor Haeckel had "in fact stated that the appearance of this work had led him to deliver his lectures." Father Wasmann then proceeds to tell us how "it seemed therefore expedient, in view of the many misunderstandings to which Haeckel's references had given rise, to publish a definite statement of my own opinion." This he accordingly did in an "Open Letter to Professor Haeckel"; but as this method of meeting the issue raised by Professor Haeckel seemed inadequate to the purpose, Father Wasmann says he "deemed it very important to give a course of lectures in Berlin itself on the same subject"—the theory of evolution.

It would appear that in Germany an appeal to a Berlin audience

is the proper procedure. An audience of Berlin scientists seems to be regarded as a jury sufficiently competent to properly adjudicate the claims of contestants of every kind. The Saxon Wittenagamot in the days of the English Heptarchy does not seem to have been regarded as a tribunal of more surpassing wisdom; and, like the Athenian Areopagus, it is to it every man with a worthy cause turns as to the body endowed with the proper jurisdiction and the requisite attainments to decide the difficulties which arise in the discussion of his problems. The arrangement in the case of Father Wasmann's lectures made the whole affair a quite unique proceeding. Indeed, its singularity makes it quite a remarkable episode in these latter days of the history of evolution. Three different nights were assigned to Father Wasmann for the delivery of his three lectures. A night was then set apart for the discussion of the problems in evolution raised by these lectures. At this discussion eleven savants in all spoke, ten of whom were opposed to Father Wasmann's views, the eleventh being noncommittal. Finally, Father Wasmann closed the discussion, speaking by way of rejoinder to the replies of his opponents; and his remarks—which lasted half an hour—closed the debate, the learned and distinguished assemblage breaking up a little after midnight. Surely Berlin has taken the problem of evolution seriously.

In one of his remarkable novels, *Sienkiwicz*, the famous Polish writer, in unrivalled word-painting, pictures one of his noble characters in the act of death to which he is assigned. By way of forlorn hope he attempts to escape from a besieged city to obtain outside aid for the beleaguered army and citizens within its walls, but finally falls into the hands of the enemy. The death to which he was swiftly condemned was that he be placed against a tree facing the soldiers and made a mark for the fiery arrows of the enemy's sharpshooters. His life was spared to the last arrow. But as the whizzing darts pierced in quick succession first his limbs, then his body, and—when he was completely covered—finally his heart, each sharp wound of the cruel Cossacks was met with a profession of Christian faith; the various verses of the Litany of Loretto kept time with the flying arrows. In somewhat similar fashion Father Wasmann met his opponents; each monistic thrust is met with a new profession of faith. The issue, too, is different; for although Father Wasmann emerges from the steady fire of his enemies with his body a forest of scientific darts, he is nevertheless victorious. It was a remarkable proceeding throughout, and Father Wasmann, evolutionist though he is, like *Sienkiwicz's* hero, never fails to make profession of his faith.

Father Wasmann's book rehearses all these proceedings at length. It gives Father Wasmann's three lectures, the replies of his opponents, and Father Wasmann's rejoinder. But as only a half hour was assigned to Father Wasmann for this rejoinder, whereas his opponents had spoken for two and a half hours, it is evident that it was absolutely impossible within the brief space of half an hour to cover adequately all the varied objections of his numerous opponents. Father Wasmann himself has evidently thought so, for in the book which he has just published he has deemed it prudent—which certainly it was—to comment at greater length on the speeches and objections of his antagonists. There is no doubt that this is by far the most valuable part of Father Wasmann's book. Written as it is in the cold, clear light of the morning after, or, more correctly speaking, weighed in the cool atmosphere of his study, with his wise and sound philosophical guides at his elbow, the objections of the various speakers are for the most part met directly, and Father Wasmann shows that, whatever the merits of his theory of evolution, he is deeply versed in the principles of sound Christian philosophy. Indeed, whatever inconsistencies or logical lapsings we may deprecate in his lectures, there is little to be desiderated in his comment. In not more than two instances has he failed, we think, to meet the objections of his opponents squarely and forcibly and crush them with overwhelming logic.

But it is not because of the discussion, unique though it all was, that this article is written. We were wholly unacquainted with Father Wasmann's writings. We knew in a vague way that Father Wasmann had been coquetting with evolution of some kind. We regarded ourselves as tolerably familiar with everything of importance that could be adduced in favor of the somewhat inconsequential and tardy theory. A somewhat close attention to the arguments of Darwin, to the pugnacious contentions of Huxley, and above all, to the philosophico-scientific treatment of the subject by Herbert Spencer—who, it may be remarked in passing, as a summarist surpassed even Darwin himself—had long familiarized us with the leading arguments at least in favor of evolution, and if not always with the facts themselves, at least with the classes of fact upon which these arguments were supposed to be based. An acquaintance of more than a quarter of a century with all the strength and all the weakness of the theory and an occasional battle with the advocates of the theory over the somewhat brusque claims made in its behalf, made us somewhat curious to learn what Father Wasmann, the Jesuit, had found in the arguments of Darwin or his followers to make him also a disciple. We had, besides, some slight acquaintance

with the theories of the Catholic evolutionists. We had read their claims and noted their inconsistencies, and we confess to a slight curiosity to know whether Father Wasmann's evolution was not also characterized by the constitutional weakness and inconsistency with which we had long been familiar in evolutionists of this class. For these reasons we shall take the liberty of examining Father Wasmann's position at close range, and of applying strictures where to us they may seem necessary.

It goes, of course, without saying, that Father Wasmann is as orthodox—even in his evolution—as Pope Pius X. himself. His work has the approval of his own Jesuit Provincial, as well as the Imprimatur of the Archbishop of St. Louis, and no one could have fought more valiantly than he has against the monists, materialists and atheists who in Germany take their stand under the ægis of evolution. From the standpoint of orthodoxy there is little to find fault with, and it is wholly from the standpoint of scientific and logical conclusion that we intend to deal with it.

Doubtless Father Wasmann will repel with indignation our statement which classes him as a disciple of Darwin. But there is no remedy for it; in his acceptance of the theory of evolution it would be impossible to class him otherwise, much as Father Wasmann may object. Indeed, the very first anomaly that strikes us in Father Wasmann's book is the desperate attempt which he makes to exorcise the doctrine of evolution of the Darwinian spectre. In common with all Catholic evolutionists, he wishes to rescue evolution from the opprobrium which attaches to the name of Darwinism. They all naturally desire to rid themselves and the theory of Darwin's name by drawing a wide distinction between the theory of evolution and the doctrine of Darwin; but the attempt is a wholly fruitless one, and moreover it is entirely unfair to Darwin. Indeed, the theory of evolution with the name of Darwin expunged would be the play of Hamlet with the Prince of Denmark left out. Father Wasmann expends so much labor and energy on his effort to accomplish the impossible that it may be well to clear up the matter.

Father Wasmann tries to draw a sharp line of separation between the theory of Darwin and the theory of evolution. He wishes Darwin's doctrine to be regarded as merely "a special branch" of the evolution theory. He says, with all the emphasis that italics can impart to the statement, that "Darwinism and the doctrine of evolution are not equivalent ideas." He even attributes to Darwinism "a Darwinian theory of the universe." He attempts to establish the distinction by telling us that evolution, "which is wider and more general, connotes the doctrine of the derivation of *all* forms of life

from earlier and simpler forms, whereas Darwinism deals with the origin of the organic species *by way only of natural selection*, and is therefore a special branch of the doctrine of evolution." And lastly, Father Wasmann enumerates what he calls four different significations of the term Darwinism, and takes considerable pains to show that none of these is identical with the theory of evolution.

Now, nothing could be more misleading, and in some instances farther from the truth, than Father Wasmann's contention under this head. Indeed, on reading it one begins to wonder whether Father Wasmann is, after all, at all acquainted with what Darwin wrote on the subject of evolution. The real truth in the matter is that Darwin is the real father and founder of the theory. It was Darwin and Darwin alone who gave to the doctrine—even in the sense in which Father Wasmann accepts it—a local habitation and a name. It is true that the subject was first broached by Lamarck, that Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of the famous founder of the evolution school, and Geoffrey St. Hilaire had also speculated along the line of the famous theory; but the theory was either scorned, or ridiculed, or ignored, or abandoned until the "*Origin of Species*," by Charles Darwin," raised the extraordinary commotion in the scientific world. In saying this we are not overlooking the part played by Mr. Wallace, but Mr. Wallace himself has joined the rest of the world in according whatever honor belongs to the authorship of the invention to Darwin. Whatever credit or discredit attaches to the creation of the theory of evolution belongs to Darwin and to Darwin alone, and all endeavor to wrest from him the glory (?) of the invention must be regarded as the bold and daring attempt of piracy or usurpation. This is so obvious that it is surprising to hear Father Wasmann question it. The concluding words of Darwin's introduction to his famous "*Origin of Species*" show plainly the scope of his work, and that it was not so much the principle of natural selection as the mutability of species which he wished to establish on a firm and lasting basis. He says:

"Although much remains obscure, and will long remain obscure, I can entertain no doubt, after the most deliberate and dispassionate judgment of which I am capable, that the view which most naturalists until recently entertained, and which I formerly entertained—namely, that each species has been independently created—is erroneous. I am fully convinced that species are not immutable."

This, then, was the end and aim of Darwin's work—to show that the barriers which were supposed to divide species from one another were not insurmountable—that species were not immutable.

The theory of natural selection, it is true, entered into his theory as a predominating factor, but its place was always secondary and subordinate; its importance was great, in his estimation, but always subsidiary. This is evident from the words which follow those above quoted, where he says:

"Furthermore, I am convinced that natural selection has been the most important, but not the exclusive, means of modification."

Darwin's evolution, then, was the formulation of the broad generalization. His main effort was to overthrow the scientific doctrine of the immutability of species, and to supplant it by the doctrine of descent with modification. For this purpose he collected numberless facts from every department of science, he collated and compared varieties, he endeavored to systematize the laws of variation, he pointed out the struggle for existence, he dived into the depths of palæontology, he brought forward arguments from morphology, embryology and rudimentary organs, he strove to trace the succession of organic beings in time and their geographical distribution in space—all this he did and a thousand times more, and all for the express purpose of proving to the world that species is not immutable, but that all the different species of organic life now existing on our globe have been developed from a few original simple forms. And this is precisely what Father Wasmann calls evolution when he tries to oppose it to Darwinism, and tells us that the former, as distinguished from the latter, "connotes the doctrine of the derivation of *all* forms of life from earlier and simpler forms." All Darwin's industrious researches, all his reflections on the mutual affinities and resemblances of organic beings, on their embryological relations, their geographical distribution, their geological succession, tended to one single purpose, viz., to show that the perfection of structure and coadaptation of the innumerable species which inhabit our globe, have all been brought about by the simple principle of descent with modification—in other words, by the principle of evolution. Hence all other evolutionists are but followers or borrowers of Darwin's broad generalization, and it is somewhat amusing to read Father Wasmann's attempts to rule him out of the school of evolution altogether. Towards the close of one of the later editions of "*The Origin of Species*" Darwin wrote—many years before Father Wasmann dreamed of evolution, we surmise—"I formerly spoke to very many naturalists on the subject of evolution, and never once met with any sympathetic agreement. It is probable that some did then believe in evolution, but they were either silent or expressed themselves so ambiguously that it was not easy to understand their meaning. Now things are wholly changed, and almost every natu-

ralist admits the great principle of evolution." Were Darwin living to-day, he might add "Now things are changed," with a vengeance; for not only is evolution accepted, but the more ardent believers in the doctrine strive to read him out of the school of evolution altogether.

Of course, in order to show that the principle of evolution was at work throughout all organic life, Darwin felt himself obliged to give some reasonable explanation of the manner in which the principle operated. He wished to convince rational beings of the truth of his hypothesis, and for this reason he was forced to cast about for a cause of its operation. Just as Father Wasmann feels himself obliged to answer to his own mind the question, By what agency does evolution accomplish its wonderful results? so did Darwin feel forced to answer it. And just as Father Wasmann imagines that the agency by which evolution operates is what he calls "the interior factors," so Darwin imagined that the agency was an external factor which he called "natural selection"; but it would be just as reasonable to undertake to read Father Wasmann out of the school of evolution by saying that his evolution is not evolution at all, but a principle of interior factors, as to exclude Darwin because natural selection was the agency in which he believed. The fact is that in seeking for an explanation of the modification and coadaptation which he believed he had discovered Darwin imagined he had found the key to it in the action of breeders who artificially selected. This suggested to him the notion of a principle of selection in nature which might be the agency at work in evolution and the instrument of modification. Thus we see that natural selection, while it is all-important in Darwin's theory, nevertheless holds only a subordinate place, although the chief agency by which evolution is supposed to be effected. Evolution is the great result with Darwin; natural selection is the means. Evolution is the great door through which all organic life passes in its wonderful variations; natural selection is the hinge on which the great door swings. Hence we fail to understand how Father Wasmann hopes to separate evolution from the doctrines of Darwin or rid the theory of evolution of the incubus of his name. But although he may change the factors, the product will be the same; though he may invent new means of evolution, the result will be evolution still; to Darwin rightly belongs organic evolution's whole realm.

Nevertheless Father Wasmann makes a desperate effort, and for this purpose, somewhat capriciously, we think, enumerates four different classes of Darwinism, each of which in turn he rejects as properly representing his own idea of evolution. Let us glance

briefly at these four divisions by Father Wasmann. His first division of Darwinism is what he calls "Darwinism in the narrower sense," which briefly means evolution "by way only of natural selection." That this was the theory of Darwin is to some extent true, as we have just seen; but it is not the whole truth. Darwin at first maintained that natural selection was not only the chief factor, but he seems to have long thought that it was the only one. That he afterwards admitted other factors, and that later he believed he had overrated the importance of natural selection, is certain. In the words from the introduction to one of the later editions of his works which I have already quoted, he expressly says he regarded natural selection an important, "but not the exclusive means of modification." Indeed, Father Wasmann himself—in a note—tells us that besides natural selection Darwin admitted "direct adaptation, correlation, compensation, etc.," as factors of evolution. Consequently it seems to us somewhat arbitrary on the part of Father Wasmann to rule Darwin so cavalierly out of all his original title deeds and letters patent in the realm of evolution. On the same grounds every upstart evolutionist would be fully justified in extruding Father Wasmann from all his evolutionary claims.

In Father Wasmann's second division of Darwinism he tells us that "In the wider sense, Darwinism is the name given to the generalization of Darwin's theory of selection, and its extension to a 'Darwinian theory of the universe.' This is identical with the monistic theory in the form of Haeckelism; according to it, the whole world has come into existence without a creator and through merely mechanical causes."

There certainly must be a grave mistake here, and the error is absolutely unfair to Darwin. We think it would be difficult for Father Wasmann to show that Darwin in any of his speculations touched upon "a theory of the universe" at all. Whatever may have been his private views on the subject, we fail to find in any of his writings any trace whatever of such speculation. He seemed to confine his studies absolutely to the organic world, and left the "theory of the universe" entirely to others. Herbert Spencer, it is true, gave us a theory of the universe, but we look in vain through Darwin's own writings or teachings for a hint of his views on the origin of the cosmos.

But especially is it in the highest degree unjust to Darwin to attribute to him the monistic theory of Haeckel. We think it is exceeding the limits of truth to associate Darwin's name with the theory that "the whole world has come into existence without a creator and through merely mechanical causes." So far, indeed, is

this from the truth that Darwin, if his own words mean anything, believed that the original organic forms came into existence by means of a creative act. Even in the later editions of the "Origin of Species" Darwin accepts the doctrine of creation of the original organic forms. He frankly discusses the question "whether species have been created at one or at more points of the earth's surface," and thinks that "the simplicity of the view that each species was first produced within a single region captivates the mind." He argues that "To my mind it accords better with what we know of the laws impressed on matter by the Creator, that the production and extinction of the past and present inhabitants of the world should have been due to secondary causes"; and in the concluding chapter of his famous work he tells us: "There is a grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one"—all showing that to the end he was a believer in creation. Indeed, Father Wasmann himself quotes this last passage to show that Darwin was a believer in a theistic evolution, and how he can at the same time endeavor to link his name with monism and materialism, and assert that he sanctioned the notion that "the whole world has come into existence without a creator and through merely mechanical causes," is an anomaly which it is difficult to account for unless on the ground of the inevitable inconsistency which seems to dog the footsteps of the Catholic evolutionist. However that may be, there is no doubt that it is a wholly unfounded calumny to attribute to Darwin a mechanical theory of the universe or the belief that "the whole world came into existence without a creator." Herbert Spencer was the author of these views—Darwin, never.

Father Wasmann tells us: "The third way in which the word Darwinism is used, popularly, is to designate the application to man of the Darwinian theory of selection. Man is assumed to be the animal most highly bred in the course of the struggle for existence, and nothing else," and here at least Father Wasmann does not make the mistake of attributing to Darwin views which he never professed. Indeed, this is the great *lapis offensionis* of Charles Darwin's theory; and perhaps we should not be surprised to find evolutionists, by fair means or by foul, attempting to divorce evolution from this stupid theory. Father Wasmann here at least is guilty of no calumny on the memory of Darwin. He only makes the mistake of saying that the term Darwinism is used "popularly" in this sense. It is used not only "popularly," but scientifically in this sense, and Darwin himself labored hard to make it a tenet of science. Indeed, Father Wasmann himself, while he indignantly refers to it,

is not so far removed in his evolution from this theory. But to Father Wasmann's relation to this division we shall return later.

"Fourthly and lastly," says Father Wasmann, "the name of Darwinism is applied in a general way to *the theory of evolution*, as I remarked before." Here again Father Wasmann uses terms somewhat loosely and in a way that is apt to be misleading. If, when he says that "the name Darwinism is applied in a general way to the theory of evolution," he means that Darwin applied his theory of evolution "in a general way" to the evolution of organic beings from creation down to the present time, and from the earliest fossil truth; but if by this expression he means—and this seems to be the case—that Darwin extended his speculations on evolution beyond the limits of the organic world and into the inorganic, then is he dealing with an assumption that is, as we have just seen, without the slightest tittle of evidence.

The object of Father Wasmann's divisions of Darwinism is, as we have already said, to rid the Christian philosophy of the stigma of the third division. For this purpose he wishes to effect a permanent divorce between Darwin and his own theory. Father Wasmann makes no secret of his motives. He frankly tells us "This confusion of ideas has done much harm in many ways. If, for instance, a serious student, engaged in scientific research, finds in his special department what he regards as evidence of the development of species, he is at once called a Darwinist, and as such is assailed by another party." Father Wasmann naturally chafes under this classification as unjust, and naturally tries to remedy the injustice. But as long as he accepts the theory of evolution we do not see how his position can be amended. He may differ from Darwin on a few minor points, but the world at large, as we have seen, must class him simply as a follower of Darwin. The name of Darwin is as inseparably interwoven with the theory of evolution as is the name of La Place with the nebular hypothesis or the name of Comté with the positive philosophy. Darwin has been the first on the field, has been the first to map out the territory of the broad generalization, and henceforth and forever has the legitimate right to claim it as his own. The claim of Christopher Columbus to the discovery of the new world was not more valid than Darwin's claim to the realm—such as it is—of evolution. Indeed, Father Wasmann himself seems to be all the while unwittingly conscious of all this; for while he is laboring so hard towards the extrusion of Darwin, at the close of his third lecture he actually proceeds to an apotheosis of evolution, with Darwin as its creator. He compares Christianity to a rock

around whose base the waves of science are breaking. Although the wave of science was successful in the case of Copernicanism, the rock stands firm, and he thinks it will be the same in the present instance. A wave had again, like the Ptolemaic system, "rested in long-continued peace at the foot of the rock" of Christianity. But "the new wave came, and it will probably be victorious in the conflict now raging between it and the old." This wave is evolution, and its mover is Darwin. He tells us—in spite of his attempts at Darwin's extrusion—"In 1859" (the year in which Darwin first published "*The Origin of Species*") came the moment when a powerful wave, starting from England, assailed us like a deluge. It increased in strength and power until the foam flecked the very pinnacles of the rock. It is true that this wave no longer bears the name of Darwin and of the Darwinian system in the narrower sense, but it is the theory of evolution which . . . has hitherto been victorious in the strife, and will probably remain so to the end." It is not a little singular, after all that Father Wasmann has written to show that evolution has nothing in common with Darwinism, to find him now speaking of that same evolution as the mighty and "powerful wave, starting from England in 1859," which "has assailed us like a deluge," and which, having "hitherto been victorious in the strife (?), will probably remain so to the end." The incongruity of statement is explicable only by the usual inconsistency of the Catholic evolutionist.

Indeed, in spite of all his ostentatious rejection of Darwinism, there is a remarkable resemblance between Father Wasmann's evolution and that of Darwin—a resemblance so striking as to suggest relationship; and on some points where there is dissimilarity Father Wasmann seems to us to out-Darwin Darwin himself. Here are a few points of resemblance on the essential features of the doctrine: (1) Darwin maintains that the theory of evolution is operative throughout all organic nature. Father Wasmann, if we understand him rightly, maintains the same, and proceeds even further, for he extends the principle not only to inorganic nature, but to the development of the cosmos. In this he far outstrips Darwin and is to some extent abreast of Herbert Spencer and Ernest Haeckel. (2) Father Wasmann rejects monophyletic evolution, whether applied to the whole kingdom of organic life or to "the whole animal kingdom on the one hand," and to "the whole vegetable kingdom on the other, as derived from one primary form." He seems to believe, however, in a polyphyletic evolution; that is the theory of "development from a variety of stocks." Darwin to the last believed in polyphyletic evolution as opposed to monophy-

letic. He discusses the question freely, and tells us "I cannot doubt that the theory of descent with modification embraces all the members of the same great class or kingdom. I believe that animals are descended from at most only four or five progenitors, and plants from an equal or less number." Monophyletic evolution, even in the sense "that all the organic beings which have ever lived on this earth may be descended from one primordial form," he regarded as neither impossible nor incredible, but the only evidence in its favor was, he believed, "chiefly grounded on analogy." In any case, he regarded it as wholly "immaterial" to the theory of evolution "whether or not it be accepted." (3) On the importance of "natural selection" as a factor of evolution there is a slight difference between Darwin and Father Wasmann; but only slight. Darwin regarded natural selection as the chief, "but not the exclusive means of modification." He admitted "the inherited effects of use and disuse," "the direct action of external conditions," and also the influence of "variations which seem to us in our ignorance to rise spontaneously." Father Wasmann, while apparently making light of natural selection, and while proclaiming it to be a merely "subsidiary factor," nevertheless tells us "it is indispensable" as such "in the theory of evolution." He regards what he calls "the interior factors" as the chief point to consider; but of these interior factors he admits no one knows anything, and what with their expediency, adaptiveness, etc., etc., it is not easy to distinguish between them and Darwin's "variations which seem to rise spontaneously"; so that on this point the difference between his views and those of Darwin, which he so indignantly rejects, appear to be the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. Nor in the last analysis do we find so wide a difference between Father Wasmann's theory and Darwin's doctrine of man's descent from beasts, which Father Wasmann finds so objectionable. Father Wasmann will undoubtedly rebel against all such interpretation of his theory. But if we understand Father Wasmann rightly, while he rejects the ape as man's ancestor, he substitutes for him a creature which, though not a beast, is not yet a man—possibly a species of Caliban. And this brings us to Father Wasmann's own theory of evolution. Before proceeding to an examination of his views on the subject, however, we may be permitted to emphasize the fact that when Father Wasmann attempts to expel Darwin from the realm of even modern evolution, he is simply beating the air. All his endeavors in this line, together with the results which are apparent from his work, remind us of the attempts of the modernists to wrest the weapons from the hands of the Biblical critics, but which, alas! resulted so ignominiously in their own com-

plete capture by the very Egyptians whom they had planned to despoil. In espousing the cause of evolution Father Wasmann has but opened the floodgates for that "powerful wave starting from England," which "has assailed us like a deluge," and which must inevitably sweep him—indeed, which seems to have already done so—from that bold and determined stand which he has nobly—though not very logically—taken against his third division of Darwinism. Meanwhile, what constitutes Darwinism must be determined by what Darwin himself taught and wrote, and in spite of all the efforts and protests of Father Wasmann, it will be difficult for him to show that he is not a disciple of Darwin in the true sense of the term, or as he himself with some ostentation tells us Haeckel has already styled him, "a Darwinian Jesuit."

Although in his preface Father Wasmann tells us that the motive of his lectures was that he aimed "at throwing light upon the important question, 'What are we to think of the doctrine of evolution?'" and although he repeats this in his first lecture when he tells his audience, "I only wish to throw some real light on the subject, trusting in this way to do a good work," we confess to some difficulty in always ascertaining Father Wasmann's exact views on some important points. More than once he rides right gallantly up to the ranks of the evolutionists, and when we expect to find him registering as an enthusiastic recruit, we are surprised by finding him backing away in a sort of awkward fashion, or at least his words have not the ring of enthusiasm we might expect to find in a newly enlisted soldier. Then, too, we find some difficulty in grasping the manner in which he endeavors to couple together the theory of creation and the great universal principle of evolution. We shall try to give a brief synopsis of Father Wasmann's attempted rehabilitation of the discredited doctrine of evolution:

(1) He calls this theistic evolution and tells us that it starts "with assuming the existence of a personal Creator."

(2) Next, "The theistic theory of the world involves the idea of creation."

(3) "Further, the theistic view, taken in conjunction with the creation of matter, lays down as its foundation the subjection to law of the whole cosmic evolution and of the entire evolution of the inorganic world, asserting that the first combination of atoms or electrons contained the definite material disposition from which, in the course of the succeeding millions of years, all the various constellations of atoms were to result by way of natural evolution. Thus we have a sufficient foundation and a sufficient primary cause for the further

natural evolution of the whole inorganic world—and this to me appears a very reasonable view to take.”

(4) We have thus got down to the time when life began to exist on the globe, and “in order to account for the origin of the first organisms, the theistic theory of life presupposes a so-called act of creation to have taken place.” This is “a production of organic bodies out of pre-existent inorganic matter.” The theistic theory, however, is ready to surrender this position of the “so-called creation” of organisms in case spontaneous generation should ever become an established conclusion of science.

(5) “The earliest laws of evolution were laid down for the organic world at the production of the first organisms.” And

(6) “The Christian theory of life” requires “the assumption that man possesses a spiritual and immortal soul.”

These are in brief the programme of theistic evolution; but it is so vague that we must try to fill in the great gaps in the bald statement from other parts of Father Wasmann’s lectures.

We may say, then, that Father Wasmann believes in a Creator and a creation of original matter. Next he believes that on this original created matter the Creator had impressed the laws of evolution, and that in consequence we have the natural evolution of our solar system and the uniform development of the cosmos as a whole, including all the heavenly bodies. “Included” in this vast universal evolution is the evolution of our own little world, and it occupies “a scarcely perceptible period of time, barely a minute, and of this minute a small fraction (that nevertheless, according to geologists, lasted millions of years), was occupied by the evolution of organic life before the appearance of man.” We have already seen that this process of evolution had either ceased or was interrupted at the entrance of life upon this planet, and that Father Wasmann was obliged to assume “a so-called creation” of the first organisms to account for the appearance of life. Two great links in the chain of evolution are yet to be accounted for by the theistic evolution, and as these are the two that most concern us, we are not a little disappointed to find that when Father Wasmann approaches them he becomes nebulous and obscure. These two are, first, the development of organic life from its appearance on the globe down to man, and next the evolution of man. In the organic world down to man, Father Wasmann seems to believe in a sort of spasmodic evolution. This evolution seems to be partial, or chromatic, or intermittent; and Father Wasmann is singularly hesitant about formulating his views in anything like a plain categorical statement. Although he tells us that in his special line of studies he has come upon “a num-

ber of interesting phenomena, which are biologically explicable only from the point of view of evolution," and although he says "The principle of the theory of evolution is the only one which supplies us with a natural explanation of these phenomena, and therefore we accept it," and although he emphasizes this latter statement by printing it in italics, we find that it is soon defecated by him to a mere transparency, and he so sublimates it that from a proof it soon becomes a mere probability. Although he finds evolution the only explanation of the phenomena which he has observed, and although he adds that therefore he accepts it, in the very same breath he asks, "But to what extent do we accept it?" And his answer is in italics: "Just as far as its application is supported by actual proofs." And when he "attempts to answer how far this is the case," the answer dwindles from "actual proofs" down to mere probability and the essence of the whole explanation seems to be merely that "the probability is in support of evolution." The evolution of original created matter and its development throughout the cosmos as well as the evolution of inorganic nature on our globe are, of course, pure assumptions on the part of Father Wasmann, without a single tittle of evidence, whether by way of direct or indirect proof or even analogy to sustain them. Consequently they are of no value whatever and are entitled to just the same respect as any other groundless speculation, but no more. Indeed, we have become somewhat sceptical as to the value of such so-called scientific speculations. They have nothing of science whatever about them, and it must be regarded as somewhat misleading to link them with the name of science in any way. We are inclined to be equally sceptical about the value of speculations which are the outcome either directly or indirectly of studies in special departments of science. No doubt it seems very imposing in a scientist to hear him speak of his own special department and his observations therein, together with his special conclusions therefrom; but we have always held fast to the inconsequence of the implied assumption. For instance, Father Wasmann is a specialist, he says, in an important department of science. His specialty is the study of ants and cockroaches. Outside of this he must, to use his own admission, "rely upon the authority of others." Candidly, we have always been of opinion that interesting and all-absorbing as is the study of ants, it is a strange place to seek for a solution of the problems of the universe. Of the scientific value of the conclusions from this department, too, we must confess to a mild scepticism ever since we once read in some of Darwin's own observations in this field, an account of how he once came upon a raid on the home of *F. Fusca* by a body of *F. Sanguinea*, how the

conquerors were marching home in triumph carrying the pupæ of the vanquished, how the survivors of the fray who had lost their home were rushing about in great agitation, and how "one was perched motionless with its own pupa in its mouth on the top of a spray of heath, an image of despair over its ravaged home." The "image of despair" has, rightly or wrongly, rendered us sceptical about the value of "scientific conclusions" drawn from this special department of science ever since.

But let us pass to Father Wasmann's Descent of Man. His exposition of the evolution of man is, as we have said, unfortunately obscure, or perhaps we should say hesitant. Father Wasmann is of course throughout his three lectures arguing against the Monism of Haeckel, but he is at the same time—as he said at the outset—endeavoring to throw light on the problem of evolution. He rejects with scorn the theory of man's descent from beasts, whether by descent we mean the whole man or merely man's body. He examines the two zoological theories of man's descent first from the higher apes and secondly from an ancestor common to both man and ape, and he rejects both absolutely. He makes a noble plea for the independence of man of the brute creation. He claims rightly that with regard to the whole man—and the whole man is body and soul united—zoology alone is not capable of giving an adequate answer to the question of his origin. He truthfully says that in investigating the origin of man, the chief question is: Whence comes his higher part? not: Whence comes his lower part? and yet, in spite of all this, it is difficult to see that Father Wasmann's theory of the evolution of man is at all an advance on the theory of his descent from beasts. For Father Wasmann seems to have a theory of his own of the evolution of man. Indeed he asks the question: "*May this theory (evolution) be applied to man, and if so, in what degree?*" And this is how he answers it: "I wish to state definitely, before discussing the matter, that we are not concerned with the application to man of Darwin's theory of evolution, for I showed in my last lecture that I was unable to accept that. But he immediately adds: "We may apply the theory of evolution to man, and still have as foundation the principles of Christian philosophy and of the Christian theory of life." We have searched in vain through Father Wasmann's book for the explanation of this theory of man which is supposed to be in perfect harmony with "Christian philosophy" and "the Christian theory of life," and fail to find it, unless it be in the speculations at the beginning of his third lecture which lead up to the question just asked and answered. In these speculations he says:

"Every atom in the human body had its primary origin in a creative act of God at the first formation of matter, although millions of years of cosmic development were to elapse, before it became a part of a human body; and in just the same way, we might imagine a hypothetical history of humanity, governed by the laws of natural development, which God pressed on the first cells at the moment when life originated."

Father Wasmann then proceeds to tell us how, "in accordance with this purely speculative supposition, man would have become man completely only when the organized matter had so far developed through natural causes, as to be capable of being animated with a human soul. The creation of the first human soul marks *the real creation of the human race*, although we might assume that a natural development lasting millions of years had preceded it."

"These," he adds, "are, it is true, only attractive possibilities, the outcome of bold speculation, but I have referred to them in order to prove to you that, if ever science is able to demonstrate to us the natural development of man from an ancestry resembling beasts, *the divine origin and the divine end of humanity will nevertheless remain unassailed and firmly established as before.*"

This may be regarded by Father Wasmann as a "bold speculation," but we can hardly agree with him in calling it an "attractive possibility." If we understand Father Wasmann's speculation rightly, it is an attempt to push aside Darwin's speculation about the descent of man, and in a measure the Mivartian hypothesis as well, and to supplant both by what might, perhaps, be properly termed a *phylogenetic germ-cell theory of humanity*. In other words, instead of the hypothesis of Mivart which refers man's ancestry to apes, assuming that at a certain period in the evolution of the ape a human soul was infused, Father Wasmann assumes that man had a direct and special ancestor for himself, which we might call man-in-preparation. It presupposes that at the creation of life God created something like a germ-cell of humanity endowed with life and the power of development, with the ultimate intention of erecting it into a man "when the organized matter had so far developed through natural causes as to be capable of being animated with a human soul." It was not yet man. It was distinct from other animal ancestry. It was not ape or beast or any other kind of obnoxious ancestor. It was worthy of the future dignity of man. It was man-matter vivified by the spark of life and left with the power of developing. It was specially created, probably out of specially prepared matter; and when the proper time in its own development came, the human soul was grafted on this living thing.

Heretofore it was incompleted man; now it became complete man. We think we have given Father Wasmann's views; but of course are subject to correction if we have misapprehended his meaning.

Of course every proposition that does not involve an antinomy of thought is possible, and Father Wasmann's "bold speculation" is no exception, but for our part it is difficult to understand how this is at all an improvement on the Mivartian hypothesis; and we utterly fail to see how Father Wasmann expects to reconcile it with "the principles of Christian philosophy." Its main object seems to be to discover a proper salve for human pride, and for this it is indeed well calculated, though the notion is purely fantastic. But whether the human soul was at man's creation grafted on an ape or on this man-in-preparation—whether we regard the preparation as homunculus, or an undeveloped Caliban, or a soulless man—seems to be of little consequence as far as "Christian philosophy" is concerned. Consequently whatever may be the merits of the speculation from a scientific point of view, from the standpoint of Christian philosophy it is absolutely worthless. There seems to be one fatal flaw in all these speculations—in which the human soul is supposed to be grafted on beings already possessing an anterior principle of life—which seems to have been completely overlooked, but which to us at least seems to completely negative all theories of this kind. It is the simplicity of the human soul. Father Wasmann himself argues nobly in favor of this principle which, nevertheless, his speculation would completely contradict. According to the teaching of St. Thomas and all Christian philosophers the soul is the first principle of life—"primum principium vite." According to Father Wasmann's hypothesis this first principle of life is introduced into an organized being already endowed with the life principle. Consequently in Father Wasmann's man there are of necessity two principles of life, one the original life of the incomplete man, the other the human soul specially created. Now how do these two principles of life existing within each of us act? Do they operate separately or conjointly? It is hardly conceivable that the first life principle is absorbed by the second, and it is equally improbable that it is annihilated by the second or by God to make room for the second. In fact a whole swarm of spectral questions emerge from Father Wasmann's speculation which he will find it difficult to allay or to reconcile with his philosophy of the simplicity of the soul. Do the two souls exist in one body? Or is the newly-created soul superadded to the first? Do they coalesce? Or does the newly-created soul absorb the evolution soul? And if so, how can such a soul be said to be simple? Or we can take the three dif-

ferent ways into which the speculation must resolve itself. Either the two souls exist in man independent of each other; or they act in unison by co-operation, or coalescence, or absorption; or the first soul is either annihilated or expelled. The theistic evolutionist will hardly be ready to accept the first. In the second case the soul of man is not simple but compound; for the third there is no warrant of any kind either in science, in philosophy, or experience.¹ Indeed we prefer to these revolting and unwarranted alternatives, which Father Wasmann's speculation forces upon us, to accept crass materialism without question. Materialistic materialism is bad enough, but materialistic spiritualism which these assumptions postulate—!! The simple question: What becomes of the animal soul? seems to be fatal from the standpoint of "Christian philosophy" to all speculations that involve the introduction of a new and human soul into a being already endowed with life. For the rest we cannot see how Father Wasmann's speculation can aid Christian philosophy in an acceptance of evolution, though as a sop to human pride it does palliate to some extent the theories of Mivart and Darwin.

It has long been a wonder to one portion of humanity that men should permit their imaginations to run away with their judgments in matters scientific, thus involving themselves in inextricable difficulties and perplexities. In the case of evolution at least this is certainly not owing to the overwhelming nature of the proofs. Nor does Father Wasmann claim to give us any new proof of the theory which he espouses. We have looked for them in vain. In dealing with this portion of the theory of evolution Father Wasmann divides the proofs for it into the "direct" and "indirect." "The direct proofs," he tells us, "are those faint traces of transformation of species, as they still may be discovered; such, for instance, as the botanist, Hugo de Vries, has described in support of his theory of mutation. He shows that in the botanical genus *Oenothera*, mullein, new forms are still being developed, which "behave like real species." Of course this is a case of *parturiunt montes* in which all that the great generalization—evolution—can bring forward in its favor is the behavior of some specimens of the mullein plant, and is ridiculous in the extreme. The great principle of evolution is supposed to have been at work throughout all time and throughout all space. On our own globe, on land and sea, throughout the entire vegetable kingdom, throughout the entire animal kingdom, throughout all

¹ Note: Possibly some expressions of St. Thomas might be regarded by some as pertinent here; but it will be difficult to show that they have application at all except possibly by way of analogy; and even analogically it would be difficult to show that they are applicable.

inorganic matter, throughout the entire cosmos—the universe—the heliocentric system, it is supposed to be operative and to have been operative throughout all past time and down to the present, and yet the only direct proof that can be adduced that there is such a principle at work or indeed that there is such a principle at all, is that some varieties of mullein are somewhat eccentric in their behavior. Of course Father Wasmann is too sensible a man to regard this as a proof, and so we may dismiss it. We wish Father Wasmann's judgment had been as correct in dealing with the "indirect proofs."

His indirect proofs are from paleontology and, it is hardly necessary to say, are affected by the constitutional weakness which are characteristic of all the proofs from this quarter in favor of evolution. Father Wasmann furnishes no new principle and not even any new variety of fact, although his facts are taken from his own observation in his own special department of ants and cockroaches.

"There are," he tells us, "hundreds of kinds of ants, which we know through their having been preserved to us in the tertiary amber of the Baltic and Sicily. Amongst them occur several genera which still exist, but scarcely a species that is identical with the present ones. We can hardly avoid coming to the conclusion that our ants are the descendants of these fossil varieties, and that they have come into being by way of natural evolution of the race, and not by way of a new creation."

Father Wasmann does not give us the mental process by which he finds himself so constrained that he "can hardly avoid coming to his conclusion;" hence we must deal with his argument in common with the whole argument from paleontology. First, however, let us hear Father Wasmann in full on this point.

"Again if we compare the fossil termites of the tertiary epoch with those now known to us, we are forced to assume that the latter are modified descendants of the former, and that they have come into being by way of race evolution, not by way of a new creation."

Had Father Wasmann, instead of "a new creation," said "a separate creation," his meaning would have been made much clearer; but the force of his reasoning in behalf of evolution would have lost half its value.

Father Wasmann cites a third instance. He says:

"Further, if we consider the oldest of the still existing varieties of termites, viz., the Australian genus *Mastotermes*, and compare the formation of the wings with that of the *Blattidæ*, or cockroaches,

both fossil and still existent, we shall *probably* find that the termites in some prehistoric palæozoic age were evolved from one and the same stock as the ancestors of our present black-beetles."

Father Wasmann adds, "I might give many such instances, but it is time for me to pass on to my photographs."

This then is the whole argument from paleontology which Father Wasmann furnishes as the indirect and only proof that evolution has taken place throughout all space and throughout all time and that it is still at work throughout the entire universe. These indirect "proofs" are a fair sample of the evolutionist's method of argument and give us a fair notion of what is meant by "the proofs of evolution." We regret to find Father Wasmann falling into the slip-slop of the evolutionist, and for this reason we shall deal with the argument somewhat at length.

If we understand Father Wasmann's argument rightly it is this: Since among the fossil ants found in the tertiary amber of the Baltic and Sicily none are discovered which are identical with some species which now exist "we can hardly avoid coming to the conclusion" that no such species ever existed before, and that our present ants must have descended by way of evolution from the fossil ants which are there found. By way of confirmation of this argument it may be added that among the fossil ants of the Baltic and Sicilian tertiaries we do find genera which still exist. Therefore the probability is that no species like those now existing ever lived and that our present ones are descended from these fossil ants which we do find there. We think Father Wasmann himself has not put his argument in stronger form than we have done. Let us examine this argument at length.

The argument looks exceedingly like trying to prove a negative. What is the proof that no such species ever previously existed and that we must look elsewhere for the ancestors of Father Wasmann's present ants? Why must we derive them from other species? And what proof is there for the non-existence of similar species? None that we can see except that they are not to be found in the "tertiary amber of the Baltic and Sicily." But surely, this can not be regarded as a proof that such a species never existed. Father Wasmann's argument is based on three distinct assumptions, not one of which holds good in reality. First, that we have a complete acquaintance with all the fossils which the full geological record contains; secondly, that every species which ever existed has become fossilized and that therefore in the complete geological record we have an exact inventory of all the species that have ever existed upon the earth; and third, that in the supposition that all forms have left fossil re-

mains, those fossil remains have been preserved. A failure in any one of these suppositions renders doubtful the position assumed by Father Wasmann; but there is failure in all three. With regard to the first, it is a truism to say that we have but a fraction of the geological record and consequently only a mere fragmentary portion of its content. The geological record is an open book, the fossiliferous strata are its open pages, the fossil remains found in those pages are the characters or letters by which paleontologists seek to reconstruct the past history of plant and animal life on this globe. But this history is not only incomplete; it is merely fragmentary. Sir Charles Lyell always insisted on its imperfection. Even Darwin himself bewails it. He tells us, "The noble science of geology loses much from the extreme imperfection of the record." And, again, "For my part, I look at the geological record as a history of the world imperfectly kept and written in a changing dialect. Of this history we possess the last volume alone, relating only to two or three countries. Of this volume, only here and there a short chapter has been preserved, and of each page, only here and there a line." Even Herbert Spencer candidly admitted that "had we an exhaustive examination of all exposed strata and of all strata covered by the sea, it would disclose types immensely outnumbering those at present known." Hence even though no identical ancestors of the now existing species of ants are to be met with in the fossils of the Baltic and Sicily, it would be an extremely rash judgment to conclude that such ancestors never existed. The conclusion which can be drawn from the absence of such forms in the amber fossils of Sicily and the Baltic is that no such fossils are to be found in the Baltic and Sicilian tertiary amber, but nothing more. It would be even rash to conclude that they never existed there; for we have no evidence to show that remains of all fossils even in that environment have been preserved. And this brings us to the second assumption, viz., that all living forms that have ever existed upon the earth have left behind them fossil remains. No one who gives the subject a thought for a moment will entertain so wild a notion. We know that fossilization is now the exception, and it is fairly certain that it has been the exception in all past time. A concurrence of the conditions which preserve for us the forms of life which at one time or other inhabited our globe in fossil state is not frequent and certainly is not constant. In all probability the proportion of organisms in relation to the whole animal and vegetable life of the globe, that have been preserved in fossil form to puzzle posterity and multiply perplexing problems, was no greater at any time than it is at present. Darwin himself admits that "The accumulation of each great fos-

siliferous formation will be recognized as having depended on an unusual occurrence of circumstances, and the blank intervals between the successive stages as of vast duration"; and Herbert Spencer again is forced to admit here that "geologists agree that even had we before us every kind of fossil which exists, we should still have nothing like a complete index to the past inhabitants of the globe; and he adds further, that "there are strong reasons for believing that the records which remain bear but a small ratio to the records that have been destroyed." He also further admitted that "the facts about fossil remains are so fragmentary that no positive conclusion can be drawn from them." Then, too, as Spencer has remarked: "The great mass of ancestral types—plant and animal—consisting of soft tissues, have left no remains whatever," which coincides with Darwin's remark that "No organism wholly soft can be preserved. "None will deny then that it would be wrong to suppose that even though we had the entire geological record before us and made an exhaustive examination of its contents, we would be very far from anything like an approximation of the varied species that have at one time or other inhabited our globe. Indeed, Spencer's words are nearer the truth, that "even though we had before us every kind of fossil which exists, we would have nothing like a complete index to the past inhabitants of the globe." So that the second assumption on which Father Wasmann's conclusion is based is groundless as the first. And just so with the third. Supposing that we had before us the complete pages of the geological record which laid before us every specimen of organized forms which that record contains, and supposing also that each organism that ever lived upon the earth had left behind some fossil remains, Father Wasmann's conclusion would not yet follow. For it is certain that numberless fossil remains have, in the course of ages been entirely destroyed. That fossils have been formed is no proof that those forms have been preserved. On the contrary, fossil remains frequently disappear. And what is more, this disappearance is by no means on a small scale. Darwin himself admits that "Shells and bones decay and disappear when left on the bottom of the sea, where sediment is not accumulating." Again he holds that "remains which become imbedded in sand or gravel, will, when the beds are upraised, generally be dissolved by the percolation of rain water charged with carbolic acid." Spencer, as we have seen, claimed that "the records which remain bear but a small ratio to the records which have been destroyed," and ascribes the destruction to igneous action. He tells us that "Many sedimentary deposits have been so altered by the heat of adjacent molten matter, as greatly to

obscure the organic remains contained in them." And he adds, "The extensive formations once called 'transition,' and now renamed 'metamorphic,' are acknowledged to be formations of sedimentary origin, from which all traces of such fossils as they probably included have been obliterated by igneous action. And the accepted conclusion is that igneous rock has everywhere resulted from the melting-up of beds of detritus originally deposited by water." Those beds of detritus were the resting places of the fossil remains. Spencer's conclusion from it all is, "How long the reactions of the earth's molten nucleus on its cooling crust, have been thus destroying the records of life, it is impossible to say; but there are strong reasons for believing that the records which remain bear but a small ratio to the records which have been destroyed." We have purposely chosen those opinions from the two founders of the theory of evolution—Darwin the father of the theory on the side of physical science, and Spencer the father of evolution taken as a philosophical theory; Darwin, who confined his researches wholly to the sphere of organic nature, and Spencer, who extended his philosophical speculations not only through all organic life, but extended it to inorganic nature and to the entire universe on the one hand, and on the other throughout the whole realm of human life whether social, political, religious, or moral.

Thus, on the authority of the founders of the evolution theory themselves, we find that the assumptions on which Father Wasmann's "proof" is based are wholly without foundation. First, our geological record as known to us gives but a mere fragment of the complete geological record as it exists in its discovered and undiscovered form; secondly, the forms of life that have been fossilized are but a fraction of the forms that have existed in past time; and thirdly, even those that have become fossilized and are preserved (though mostly yet undiscovered), bear no proportion to the records that have been destroyed by the action of igneous rocks, by the action of chemical dissolvents, and by other known and unknown causes. What then are we to think of Father Wasmann's conclusions from palaeontology? What are we to think of his expression "we can hardly avoid coming to the conclusion" and "we are forced to assume" that because no ancestors have been found for these specific ants, we have therefore come upon a case of evolution? In the face of the facts and conditions which we have just seen it seems a little premature to maintain that such ancestors never existed, although none of their remains have been, not indeed preserved—for of this we know nothing—but discovered. Spencer's conclusion, already quoted, that "the facts about fossil

remains are so fragmentary that no positive conclusion can be drawn from them," seems to us to be the only sane one in the field of palaeontology. But in Father Wasmann's mouth this argument has a character of inconsistency peculiarly its own. For in his argument against an ape ancestry of man he draws from similar premises a directly opposite conclusion from that which here "he is forced" to accept. His argument in one case is: the Termites have no ancestors of their own; therefore they must be descendants of the ants of the Baltic tertiary; while in the case of man his argument against Haeckel and monism is: Man has no ancestor therefore he is not descended from the ape, but from some ancestor unknown. But supposing a thorough-going monist like Ernest Haeckel should undertake to apply his "ant" argument to man and say: We find fossil apes and prosimiae in abundance, but nowhere do we find fossil human species, therefore, we are forced to conclude that man must be descended from apes or prosimiae, we do not see what reply Father Wasmann could well make, since it is taken from his own mouth.

The most interesting argument for Father Wasmann's evolution would have been that taken from his own experience, but as this is given only in the condensed form of the press report we can merely surmise its force from Father Wasmann's conclusions which he gives more at length. Father Wasmann does not claim to have discovered any new facts or principles, but merely states that he has observed some phenomena "which are biologically explicable only from the point of view of evolution." This, however, is strong language and he supplements it by telling us, "I wish to draw your attention to the fact that accommodation to the life of ants and white ants or termites has in all probability led to the formation of new species, genera and families among their guests, which belong to very various families and orders of insects. In some cases (*Taumetoxena*) the characteristic marks have been so completely altered by accommodation that it is scarcely possible for us to determine to which order of insects this strange creature belongs. In other cases (*Termytomyia*) the whole development of the individual is modified in such a way that it resembles that of a viviparous mammal rather than that of a fly."

Father Wasmann here calls attention to the modification in what he calls "the characteristic marks" of species and also to changes in their physical development. Now it must be observed that among the lower forms of life the divisions of genus and species are not always very clearly defined. Indeed what distinctions we have here are the factitious division of naturalists, and

seldom do any two agree in their classifications. The family lines are not easily distinguished; very often the lines between orders and classes are not so sharply outlined. Linnaeus, the father of classification, misled by "characteristic marks," actually classed an homopterous insect as a moth. The numerous instances of dimorphism, trimorphism and polymorphism in individuals of the same species both in plants and animals, have long been the wonder and perplexity of naturalists. Among these lower orders naturalists meet with startling variation within the limits of known species—variations which cannot possibly be the result of evolution, for they occur in members of the same family, or offspring of the same parent. These alterations occur not only in the characteristic marks, but also in the physiological structure. Often these differences are met with in the different sexes of the same species. To pass over those cases which are so familiar to every one—the difference between the male and female of the peacock, the pheasant, the fowl—if we go into Father Wasmann's own domain, we shall find that some ants are winged while their females are wingless—a wide morphological difference. Mr. Wallace was the first to call attention to the fact that among butterflies in the Malayan Archipelago, the females of a certain species regularly appear under two or even three conspicuously distinct forms, not connected by intermediate varieties. The same is said to be true of certain Brazilian crustaceans. Of the Lepidoptera Mr. Wallace says "there is no possible test but individual opinion to determine which of them shall be considered as species and which as varieties." Darwin calls all this "very perplexing" as it undoubtedly is, and he further tells us: "It certainly at first sight appears a highly remarkable fact that the same butterfly should have the power of producing at the same time three distinct female forms and a male; and that an hermaphrodite plant should produce from the same seed-capsule three distinct hermaphrodite forms, bearing three different kinds of females and three or even six different kinds of males. Nevertheless, these cases are only exaggerations of the common fact that the female produces offspring of two sexes, which sometimes differ from each other in a wonderful manner." Surely, in all these instances there is no room for evolution. Now let us suppose that Father Wasmann had met with two of those individual types in the course of his investigations, without any previous knowledge of their close, intimate and immediate relationship. Doubtless, he would recognize them as belonging to the same order, at least the order to which it belonged, and would in all probability feel that he was forced to attribute the relationship to evolution, precisely as he does in the

present instance. Nevertheless, not only was there no room for the intervention of evolution at all—not even room for the difference of genus or species—for in spite of their “wonderful differences,” they were offspring of the same parent. We should think Father Wasmann would endeavor to clear up this inexplicable fact before he derived any proofs—even indirect and merely probable ones—from the “characteristic marks” or morphological structure of beings in the lower world of life.

Add to this that, as Darwin has said, “no one quite understands what is exactly meant by the term species,” that we are profoundly ignorant of the laws of variation, their extent and efficacy, that it is naturalists themselves who have drawn the lines between species and species—not always with the greatest accuracy—and it will be easy enough to account for the results of Father Wasmann’s observations, we think, without an appeal to evolution. We ourselves were, we think, the first to call attention in this REVIEW to the fact that the creation of species as species was not a dogma of religion at all, but a doctrine of science, and if scientists are not yet prepared to define clearly the lines of separation beyond which organisms do not pass and become new established species, the fault is the fault of science. Indeed, viewed in this way evolution seems to be but an expression to cover our ignorance and shield our indolence. Various definitions have been given to the term species; but as Darwin has remarked, “No one definition has satisfied all naturalists.” Darwin thinks the term includes the unknown element of a distinct act of creation”; but it should be remembered that it is science which has assigned this meaning to it; not religion. The confusion over the lines of demarcation in the lower forms of life is among the scientists themselves, and it is science and not religion which is interested in the “characteristic marks” and physiological “development” of organisms in the lower spheres of existence. Doubtless, if by evolution Father Wasmann means that among the inferior orders of animal life the tendency to vary is greater than in the great systematic categories or that in this realm the lines of the limitations of variation are more elastic; in other words, that there is a greater plasticity of nature in the lower forms of life, he may not be so far from the truth; but it would be a travesty of language to dignify this by the name of evolution; it is simply variation. Indeed, we are of opinion that the term variation will cover all the facts that Father Wasmann has found, that is, when scientists will have agreed among themselves as to what constitutes the true meaning of their own term “species.”

There is one other proof of evolution which is usually brought

forward and upon which Father Wasmann barely touches—and then only to reject it—which we cannot pass over, so peculiarly does Father Wasmann deal with it. His manner of accepting and rejecting it, like his acceptance and rejection at the same time of evolution, and his attempted ejection of Darwin from his own theory, seems to us highly capricious and wholly unreasonable. This proof is what Father Wasmann calls “the biogenetic principle,” but which among evolutionists of the English school is known as the argument from embryology. The absolute tyranny of the evolution theory was perhaps never better exemplified than in Father Wasmann’s treatment of this “proof.” Incidentally, too, it demonstrates the inconsistency of the Catholic evolutionist. Roughly this argument is: that the individual organism in its development from the cell to maturity passes through all the stages of the evolution of the race; or, as Father Wasmann puts it: “According to it the development of the individual is only an abbreviated and partially modified reproduction of the development of the race.” Father Wasmann seems to accept this as a principle, when it suits him and to reject when it does not suit him; so that like evolution we must regard it as spasmodic in its action. He says with full italicised emphasis:

“I maintain, therefore, that *we cannot accept the biogenetic principle* in its entirety, nor can we sanction its application to man in order to *prove his descent from beasts.*” Nevertheless, we find him telling us: “It is an undeniable fact that, both among the higher and lower animals, instances occur of stages of individual development, which can be explained only by regarding them as temporary traces of a previous stage of development, which was permanently impressed on their ancestors.” This sounds somewhat strange coming from a man who rejects the biogenetic principle; but more follows. Father Wasmann thinks that he has discovered instances of this rejected principle in his own special department and we shall let him speak for himself. He says: “Something similar occurs in the case of the *Termitoxenia*, a very small fly that lives with the white ants. You saw a diagram of it during my first lecture. It presents the peculiar feature of having for a short time, whilst it is passing through the stenogastric stage as a full-grown insect, genuine veined wings in the still cuticular appendices to the thorax”; and he adds in wonderment, “I could scarcely believe my eyes, when I noticed this for the first time in my series of sections. Subsequently, these little hooked appendages to the thorax grow into horns, and serve as organs of touch and exudation, and enable the fly to balance itself, and no trace of likeness to wings remains.”

Seeing is, of course, believing, and Father Wasmann, unable to withstand the force of this convincing evidence, adds: "Probably we have here a certain amount of reproduction of the growth of some ancestors." We are glad to find Father Wasmann prefixing 'probably' to the results of his marvellous discovery, but soon his enthusiasm seems to get the better of him and he tells us "I might refer to a number of similar instances, but what has been said will suffice to show that there are really cases, in which the evolution of the individual gives us a clear indication where to seek the ancestors of the race." So far, Father Wasmann's mental processes are sufficiently clear on the subject; but what follows seems to be enveloped in fog and mystery. He adds: "Nevertheless, if we are to explain such a stage of evolution as being a repetition of some hypothetical stage in the life of its ancestors, this explanation must be the only possible one (!)—and it is my opinion that there is no such stage in the ontogeny of man." Now, the riddle of the sphinx is easy compared with this sybilline language of Father Wasmann. And then why should he balk the great principle when he comes to man? Was not the principle sufficiently proven to him in the case of the parasites of the white ants? In the "Discussion," which was not discussed, but written out at his leisure, Father Wasmann returns to the mystery of his words and this is how he interprets them for Dr. Smith—Jena, who called his attention to the inconsistency. He says: "I never recognized the *biogenetic principle as such*, either in my third lecture nor in my book on *Biology and the Theory of Evolution*. The instances adduced by me, to which Dr. Smith—Jena referred, were exceptional cases of *relatively rare occurrence*, in which the development of the individual gives us a clue to the evolution of the species. But the fact that these are exceptional and of rare occurrence shows that the biogenetic principle is not a general law." But if it be not a "general law," how does Father Wasmann know that in his own particular discovery (!) he has "a clue to the evolution of the species?" Why should it prove to be the law in his case and not in that of others? There are those who maintain that they, too, have discovered instances of it and those also who insist that it is a general law. Why should Father Wasmann be so confident of its import in his own case and so positive in his rejection of it in other cases? Why should he be so positive that he has come upon a real case of parallel between ontogenesis and phylogenesis? Indeed, Father Wasmann's attitude here is wholly capricious and in spite of all his protestations can only be interpreted as a confirmation of their position by those who maintain the validity of the biogenetic principle.

Indeed, we think the admonition of the nursery rhyme, "The gobbels'll get you if you don't watch out," is particularly appropriate for Father Wasmann on this particular point. For the rest we are sorry to find Father Wasmann lending himself to an effort to revive interest in the argument from embryology, especially when scientists themselves seem to be abandoning it as valueless.

Let us, however, try to get the force of Father Wasmann's argument; and perhaps we can obtain some idea of its value and efficacy more readily by taking one from the "number of similar instances" of the biogenetic principle which he cites rather than from Father Wasmann's own instance. As one of those instances, Father Wasmann mentions the case of the whalebone-whale, which is one of the stock arguments of evolutionists in behalf of the biogenetic principle. We shall try to follow Father Wasmann's argument in this case, which he accepts as a "clue" and an "indication where to seek the ancestors of the race"; but first a brief digression may be permitted. Whether the principle of evolution has or has not been at work in other directions there is one place at least where it seems to be a marked success—the evolution of error. Indeed, so successful has it been in this department of knowledge that it has actually differentiated a new spick-and-span species of fallacy and developed it to such perfection that it has come into general use throughout the entire school of evolution and seems to be a characteristic mark of every member of that school from Darwin down to Father Wasmann. This new species we may call the fallacy of the double hypothesis; and its operation is thus-wise. First a hypothesis is framed, wholly possible, more or less probable, absolutely without proof, and with little presumption in its favor. After more or less discussion this hypothesis quietly takes its place as a proven fact, though it has not progressed in its evolution beyond the assumption stage. Later, in another totally different department of science another totally different hypothesis is needed for another totally different purpose. It is forthwith invented, and, after its invention, follows the usual discussion, when suddenly some one discovers that the first hypothesis has some bearing on the question. The first hypothesis is instantly invoked, and *presto!* the second hypothesis is proven by the first. Meanwhile the fact that it has been instrumental in proving the truth of the second hypothesis at once raises the first to the dignity of a truth also. Occasionally, not only two, but entire series of hypotheses thus become established truths. The argument from the whalebone-whale is a brilliant example of this. Father Wasmann says of it:

"As an example of this (the biogenetic principle), I may refer

to the teeth which the embryos of the whalebone-whale still possess, although subsequently they degenerate into whalebone If we may compare with it the further fact that geology has ascertained, viz., that the whalebone-whale only in the tertiary period succeeded to the toothed whale, which may be regarded as its probable ancestor, the conclusion is obvious. The whalebone-whale is descended from an older toothed whale, and the reason why, in the development of the individual whalebone-whale, there is a stage at which teeth appear, lies in the fact (!) that the ancestors of the present whales passed through this stage of development, and it remains up to a certain definite point in the growth of the embryo." This is a splendid specimen of the fallacy of the double hypothesis. Indeed, there is a third hypothesis which plays a silent part also. Father Wasmann says "that the whalebone-whale only in the tertiary period succeeded the toothed whale, which may be regarded as its probable ancestor"—mark the "probable," and the double assumption, first of the succession (which is very far from certain) and secondly of the relationship by descent. The first hypothesis then—destitute of every vestige of proof—is, that the whalebone-whale is descended from the toothed whale. The second hypothesis which is the one seeking for proof, is that the appearance of the embryonic teeth is due to the biogenetic principle. (This is the hypothesis which tell us that ontogenesis, or the evolution of the individual we have a reproduction of phylogenesis, or the evolution of the race; in other words, that the individual embryo up to maturity passes through all the forms through which the race has passed.) In this particular case Father Wasmann wishes to prove it by the appearance of the teeth in the embryo whales. And this he does by the simple process of assuming his first hypothesis to be a "fact." We have already elsewhere called attention to this new species of fallacy which consists in basing one hypothesis on another and assuming the edifice thus raised to be a solid structure, whereas it is merely a castle in the air without any foundation whatever. Yet the whole literature of evolution teems with this species of reasoning, and the fallacy vitiates every argument and every conclusion of the entire school. It is a monstrous form of deception against which an effective protest should be made, though often the deception is wholly unconscious, and for the most part dupes even its own authors. It is manifest, however, that outside the school of evolution, any writer who had the interests of truth in mind would state plainly and candidly the wholly conditional aspect of the argument; and in such a case Father Wasmann's argument would run somewhat in this fashion: **Fossil remains of the whalebone-whale**

have been found in the tertiary deposits, but in no earlier ones; and for this reason it is supposed that this species of whale did not exist earlier. Toothed whales, however, have been found in earlier strata, and consequently it is surmised that the whalebone-whale may be descended from the toothed whale. If this supposition should prove to be true, and the whalebone-whale should prove to have the toothed whale for its ancestor, the appearance of teeth at a certain stage in the development of the embryo whalebone-whale would be a marked confirmation of the biogenetic principle. We think we have put the argument as strongly as the facts in the case will warrant, but Father Wasmann, in true evolutionist fashion, tells us "the conclusion is obvious," and that "it will suffice to show that there are really cases in which the evolution of the individual gives us a clear indication where to seek for the ancestors of the race."

Before taking leave of Father Wasmann's book there is one other feature of his evolution which we wish to note for the reason that in the light of admitted facts it seems to us to be wholly untenable. It is that development with progress or advance seems to be regarded by him as the law of evolution. Instead of being explicitly stated, this is taken for granted throughout his entire work. Indeed, he seems to think there can be no evolution without progress. Advance is essential to the doctrine. Thus in his attempted differentiation of Darwinism from evolution, he tells us that evolution "connotes the doctrine of the derivation of *all* forms of life from earlier and simpler forms." In his third lecture he says: "It is essential to the very nature of evolution to advance from what is simple to what is complex." Following Hertwig, he has told us: "As this process continues, the corresponding new generation must advance somewhat further than its immediate predecessor"; and still again he says: "The more highly any animal is organized, the more stages of development must it pass through before reaching the complex final stage." Hence there is no doubt whatever that at least Father Wasmann's evolution includes the notion of advance or progress from the simple to the complex or from a low state of organization to a high one.

Now, few things are more certain than that such a notion is wholly incompatible with the facts of palæontology. Indeed, it is surprising in the extreme how prone evolutionists generally are to forget this all-important fact. For one of the real lessons which palæontology teaches us is, that if there has been an evolution of organic life throughout the past ages, such an evolution must have taken place without progress of any kind. We have many organic forms existing at the present day which are identical with the ear-

liest which palæontology discloses, and assuredly in these there could not have been advance. Father Wasmann himself tells us that the Baltic tertiary ants are in some cases identical with many that exist at present. Surely here there could have been no advance.

And this was the view of Professor Huxley. Half a century ago he told us: "The paleozoic age is a long distance off from the present, but the *Pleuracanthus* of that age, according to the testimony of palæontology, differs no more from our present sharks than these differ from one another." Where, then, is the advance? The same is true of the Ganoid fishes. Where is the progress or advance? The essential characters of the Crocodilia among reptiles of our day are identical with those of the Mesozoic epoch. Where is the advance? And even among mammals, those of the Triassic and Oolitic species differ from those of the present no more than these last differ from one another. Where here do we find advance?

Professor Huxley took each great division of the animal world which was remarkable for a long range of period throughout the geological series and tried to ascertain what had been the advance from simple to complex structure. Let us glance briefly at a few of his conclusions. The Protozoa range throughout the whole geological series from the lower Silurian to the present day; the most ancient forms are exceedingly like those that now exist; they are not more embryonic or less differentiated. Among the Coelenterata the Tabulate Corals range from the Silurian to the present day; the ancient *Heliolites* are quite as highly organized as our present *Heliopora*. Among Molluscs, he asks "In what respect is the living *Waldheimia* less embryonic, or more specialized, than the palæozoic *Spirifer* . . . ?" And conversely he asks in what sense *Loligo* or *Spirula* are in advance of the *Belemnite*. It is the same with the *Annulosa*. It is the same with the lower vertebrates and with the higher vertebrates. He asks: "In what sense are the Liassic *Cheilonia* inferior to those which now exist? How are the Cretaceous *Ichthyosauria*, *Plesiosauria* or *Pterosauria* less embryonic, or more differentiated species, than those of the Lias?" It is not necessary to multiply instances. Where, then, is there evidence of Father Wasmann's evolution, to "the very nature of" which "it is essential to advance from what is simple to what is complex"? Professor Huxley sums up by saying:

"These examples might be almost indefinitely multiplied, but surely they are sufficient to prove that the only safe and unquestionable testimony we can procure—positive evidence—fails to demonstrate any sort of progressive modification towards a less embryonic, or less generalized, type in a great many groups of animals of

long-continued geological existence. In these groups there is abundant evidence of variation—none of what is ordinarily understood as progression; and, if the known geological record is to be regarded as even any considerable fragment of the whole, it is inconceivable that any theory of a necessarily progressive development can stand, for the numerous orders and families cited afford no trace of such a process.”

Professor Huxley concludes his investigations on this subject by the query: “What, then, does an impartial survey of the positively ascertained truth of paleontology testify in relation to the common doctrines of progressive modification which suppose that modification to have taken place by a necessary progress from more or less embryonic forms, or from more to less generalized types” (Father Wasmann’s theory) “within the limits of the period represented by the fossiliferous rocks?”

And his answer is: “It negatives those doctrines; for it either shows no evidence of any such modification or shows it to have been very slight; and as to the nature of that modification, it yields no evidence whatsoever that the earlier members of any long-continued group were more generalized than the later ones.” Huxley’s conclusion has never been disputed, but is the accepted doctrine of the schools to-day. In one instance Huxley himself maintained twenty years later that there was a notable exception, but the evidence seemed to be wanting to prove the authenticity and the exception has fallen into innocuous desuetude. What, then, are we to think of Father Wasmann’s evolution, which postulates advance from one generation to another and advance from the simple to the complex as constant and continuous?

Father Wasmann says, with considerable *naivete*, that evolution is not an experimental science. We quite agree with him; but it is not an experimental science for the simple and conclusive reason that it is not a science at all. It deserves to be ranked as a science no more than the cooling theory of La Place and Kant can be regarded as a science, or than Christian Science can be regarded as a science. Indeed, Father Wasmann himself admits all this, for he shows with much circumlocution that it is but a hypothesis built on several other hypotheses. “It is essentially a theory,” he tells us, “based on a group of hypotheses.” Such a theory can hardly be called a science; but, since these hypotheses are “in harmony with one another,” Father Wasmann thinks that they “afford the most probable explanation of the origin of organic species”—a proposition which he has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate.

Father Wasmann’s evolution breaks down in the same way

when we come to regard it—as he wishes it to be regarded—in the light of a great universal principle, whose sway extends throughout all organic life on our globe, throughout inorganic nature, and throughout the entire universe. Now, a great universal principle that breaks down at every important point, and that is discoverable in only out-of-the-way corners, and even there not very discernibly but merely supposedly, is no principle at all. Father Wasmann's evolution starts with the primal creation of matter and is supposed to be actively at work in the development of this matter—whatever that means; Father Wasmann or no one else understands—down to the time when this matter is ready for the introduction of life. Here suddenly it halts, breaks down completely, indeed so completely that Father Wasmann is forced to introduce “a so-called act of creation,” as he styles it, to account for the origin of life, and by the intervention of this new auxiliary, evolution starts in again with fresh courage and attempts a renewal of its operations. It must be remembered, however, that up to this point the existence of evolution and its labors in the development of matter is purely conjectural and without the slightest shadow of reason, that it now is and ever will remain as incapable of proof as it is of disproof, and that when we come down to the beginning of life on the globe this conjecture breaks down completely. Even after its new start on the creation of life on the globe we fail to find that Father Wasmann has proved it to be universal; it is far from it. But the evolutionist, still confident, clings to his theory and is still a firm believer in its efficacy; and, getting a fresh field with its new start in organic nature, he gives it full sweep through this vast realm; for is not this its own home, wherein he first suspected its existence—the field of its energy, its industry, its efficacy, the scene of its own special triumphs and demonstrable victories? Throughout this whole realm it has universal sway. *Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice.* Well, what do we find? Let Father Wasmann answer in behalf of his great principle, of whose “laws” and “interior causes” and “internal factors” he talks grandiloquently, although he admits that he knows absolutely nothing about them. “In the case,” he tells us, “of the same genus, the genera of the same family, and often for the families of the same order, even for the orders of the same class, the probability is in support of evolution.” Now, when it is remembered that in coming down the history of matter from its first creation to our own time, this is the first trace we find of the great universal principle, and that this vestige is mere probability, and that this probability is confined to the lower forms of organic matter, we must regard it as only an optimism of the most cheerful kind which would

find in such a probability a solid basis on which to found a great "science." For outside of the limits which Father Wasmann describes he is forced to admit: "But the higher we ascend in the systematic categories, and the more closely we approach the great chief types of the animal world, the scantier becomes the evidence; in fact, it fails so completely that we are finally forced to acknowledge that the assumption of a monophyletic evolution of the whole animal kingdom of organic life is a delightful dream without any scientific support." Hence here in its own special realm, where evolutionists of every school admit that the great principle has absolute sway, we find whole tracts and continents, so to speak, where its existence is but "a delightful dream"; so that even here evolution breaks down seriously. And even accepting this fragmentary evolution within its own special realm to be some slight evidence in favor of the principle, Father Wasmann declares that when we come down to man, the principle again breaks down irretrievably. Where, then, is the evidence of the existence of this great principle? It fails us everywhere. To insist on a great principle of evolution running uninterruptedly throughout the entire universe and producing all inorganic phenomena as well as all organic life, and to maintain that such a principle is demonstrable from the crazy-quilt patchwork of evidence in our possession, is like proving that all the great bodies of water on the Continent of Europe are expansions of one great river which is invisible except where the lakes appear. Supposing the principle of gravitation were thus chromatic and elliptical? Gravitation is demonstrable everywhere, from the dewdrop to the motion of the spheres.

"That very law that moulds a tear and bids it trickle from its source, That law preserves our earth a sphere and guides the planets in their course."

When Father Wasmann can speak thus confidently of his principle of evolution, he may ask us to accept it. At present it seems as though we were all expected to transfer our faith from religion to science, so scant is the evidence in proof of the scientific principle. For the rest, Father Wasmann's attempt to establish a harmony between evolution and Christian philosophy seems to us, like all other attempts of the kind, an endeavor to ride around the ecliptic of evolution with one horse of heaven and one of earth.

Before completely surrendering ourselves, however, to an unhesitating acceptance of Father Wasmann's theistic evolution or to an unquestioning faith in its truth, it is just as well to remember that all evolution, whether theistic or atheistic, rests for proof on just two classes of argument, one the argument from embryology,

or, as Father Wasmann calls it, the biogenetic principle, the other the argument from palæontology; that of the former Father Wasmann himself is quite pronounced in his repudiation and that he is far from alone in his rejection of it; that of the latter Herbert Spencer admitted years ago that "the facts about fossil remains are so fragmentary that *no positive conclusion* can be drawn from them"; that this sane conclusion cannot be contradicted; that it was true when Spencer first penned it, that it is true to-day, and that it will remain true for all time.

SIMON FITZSIMONS.

Lima, N. Y.

SCHOLASTIC APOLOGETICS.

CHANCE brought to our notice not long ago a work bearing a very recent date and obviously intended to give the general, and especially the non-Catholic, reader a brief yet comprehensive and reliable view of Scholastic Philosophy from a Catholic standpoint, and the extremely questionable manner in which this important subject was treated, taken in conjunction with other recently appearing and similarly defective works, seemed to demand a serious review of the whole subject and *status* of what may, perhaps, not inaptly be termed "Scholastic Apologetics."

We are, of course, no longer surprised at the interested obloquy which its enemies have constantly sought to cast upon this elaborate and venerable system of thought; but the title, the preface, and the author of the work now in question would lead one to expect a leal, and even devoted, exposition and defense of what has now become, in the minds of most men, the Church's consecrated philosophy. But, in place of this, a very evident desire to please and placate has led to so serious a mutilation of the system, and to so thorough a discrediting of its principal theses, that the general reader could not but be misled as to what Scholastic Philosophy really is in itself, and as to how it is regarded by legitimate Catholic authority.

As already indicated, this work and this author are by no means alone. This same excessive and consequently destructive conciliation is the chosen tone of many more recent Catholic writers; and, as such, it renders a rigorous examination imperative. We sincerely regret any special reference to persons or to personal interests; and if we choose this particular author and work, it is only as types of their respective classes, and in order that the ideas and

expressions here criticized may be given *verbatim*. It may be well to mention here that, excepting Latin words and specially indicated passages, the italics and parentheses throughout are our own. In arranging the work, it has seemed best to quote at once the utterances both of these ultra-liberal writers and those of supreme Catholic authority, in order that the state of the question may be made apparent without delay. Later, a slight analysis and commentary will be attempted.

I. CRITICISED QUOTATIONS.

In the first place, we may point out, as a kind of introduction to the author's peculiar views, that he is a free and rather patronizing critic of St. Thomas. "On the question," he says, "of Divine Providence and the condition of the soul after death, it must remain at least doubtful whether Avicenna and Averroes or Saint Thomas were better exponents of Aristotle's mind." Again, "On the whole, he (St. Thomas) was more concerned to square Aristotle with Christian teaching than to square himself with Aristotle." Passing to the Scholastic system itself, the author first points out the undoubted truth that "all Scholastic Philosophy is based upon the distinction between matter and form," and truly says that "we must absolutely attend to it, if we are to have any notion of Scholasticism at all." But he then proceeds to give this very doctrine a more than dubious character by saying, "The hypothesis of there being one mother-stuff underlying every variety of material body (sic) . . . is indeed a doubtful hypothesis." It is true that in the author's context these words may apply exclusively to Suarez's special variation on the theme of *materia prima*; but, even so, the ambiguity remains; and it is practically certain that the general reader, for whom the book is intended, would apply the doubt to the general Scholastic doctrine. Elsewhere the reference to matter and form is clear and explicit, yet not less derogatory. "The extension of hylomorphism," the author says, "to the whole of nature, and notably to the constitution of inorganic bodies, is a much more dubious speculation." The reservation here indicated is to be found in the author's previous assertion that "the Neo-Thomist will strongly hold that in man the soul is the form, the body, the matter." The author says that this position will be taken upon biological grounds; but many will doubtless persist in believing that the Council of Vienna and that of the Lateran are not without influence here; and this notwithstanding the author's further and rather peculiar assertion that Scholasticism's "central tenet of the composition of all things out

of matter and form *has nothing to do* with Theology." Without attempting here a complete discussion of this last question, we simply note that some very high Catholic authorities have thought that the Scholastic doctrine positing the human soul as the form of the human body is very closely connected, not only with Theology, but also with the faith itself. Cardinal Zigliara, certainly a representative Scholastic philosopher and an undoubted ecclesiastical authority, may be taken as a type of these latter, and his mind concerning this matter may be learned by consulting page 175 of the second volume of his "Summa Philosophica." Historically, at least, the doctrine has had a great deal to do with Theology. Its relation to faith is still a matter of earnest discussion, and will probably long continue to be a subject for the deepest consideration. But, this aside, we have seen that on the general theory of matter and form all the author's reservations vanish. He even mildly ridicules the older methods of investigating even in cases where their weakness has yet to be demonstrated, and implies that there has never yet been a really philosophical inquiry into the subject of matter and form. "The doubt," he says, "will have to be cleared up. *if ever it is cleared up*, not by abstract arguments going upon the obvious phenomena of daily life, such as the burning of tow, but by all the elaborate apparatus now at the command of the chemist and electrician; even the highest methods of mathematical calculus may be brought in to aid. Verily there is work for the twentieth century schoolman who intends conducting a *thoroughly philosophical* inquiry into *materia prima*." To show, moreover, that his own criticisms in this regard are comparatively mild, he speaks of "many Catholic" philosophers who simply reject matter and form altogether. "Many Catholic philosophers have rejected, and do reject, matter and form." We confess that these "many" Catholic philosophers are not well known to us, but some, at least, no doubt, exist. Human nature is a very perverse quantity, and not all the popes that ever reigned are sufficient to keep some "Catholics" in line; as is evidenced very clearly by the existence of the very works that we are now considering. But even granting the complete objective reality of these numerous insubordinate Catholic writers, their existence throws no real light upon the question. As Cardinal Zigliari says in the other connection just noted, "*Ipsi videant*." The only thing to be said about such writers is that they are rather poor samples of Catholic scholarship to be placed before strangers as typical of Catholic thought.

Having thus registered, in these and many other similar passages, the practical rejection by himself and "many" other Catholic philosophers of what he himself declares to be Scholastic Philoso-

phy's "central" cosmological thesis of matter and form, the author proceeds to a similar process regarding a fundamental doctrine of Scholastic Psychology. "Another choice," he says, "*likewise beyond our prediction*, will have to be made in Psychology, on the retention or discarding of the 'active' and the 'potential' intellect"; and though he says here, "We are now merely indicating questions, not solving them," he immediately gives his solution—avoiding, however, the responsibility for so doing—by saying, "One schoolman of no mean ability, writing in a French Review, has urged the abandonment of speculation on 'active' and 'potential'; he would make the permanent self, underlying transient impressions, the first intellectual idea grasped by the mind," etc., etc. It may be suggested here that the popes in their solemn encyclicals have not issued a call for volunteers in the matter of philosophical speculation, but have explicitly and specifically enjoined the teaching of Scholastic Philosophy. They are not searching for separate theories for merely temporary or tentative use. What they do demand, and what they have a right to demand, is a corps of professors humble enough and loyal enough deeply to study and faithfully to teach a complete philosophical system already fully possessed, understood, and approved. And even for those who seemingly find it very hard to obey, it may be remarked that any opinion worth holding is also worth direct, open expression; and that the increasingly favorite modern method of putting what we want to say in the mouths of others is hardly worthy of a philosopher of whatever school he may be.

With a fatalistic kind of progression, the author next advances to Natural Theology; and in it, likewise, gives another typical example of his *penchant* for invalidating central Scholastic tenets, by choosing for his attack the well-known argument for the existence of God drawn from a necessarily existing "first mover" himself unmoved. The author elsewhere calls this a "favorite" argument of St. Thomas—in order, it would seem, to show that he attacks by preference that which the great scholastics have especially advocated—and he explicitly assures us that in his own treatment of it he is not malevolent, though it is difficult to see just how else he would act if he were. In discussing it, he points out several of what he considers to be fundamental defects, which, if really existent and essential, any schoolboy must have noticed; and then suggests an equal number of more than doubtful means for its rehabilitation by the Neo-Thomist "if he wishes to vindicate a favorite argument of his master." The remedies suggested involve considerations concerning the "energies of the universe" and the "principle of the conservation of energy," matters on which, as here applied, we shall

speaking later on. In the meantime, one could scarcely credit, if it were not before his eyes, the continually flippant manner in which precisely the most important Scholastic theses are singled out for ridicule by a writer explicitly professing to believe in Scholasticism, and to be engaged in its exposition and defense.

Yet the author, later on, goes further than he has yet done in any of these particular instances; for he passes from details to the system as a whole; and, as a whole, he practically concludes for its rejection. Considering the weakness and decline which marked its later history and the reasons therefor, he asks and answers, "Was Scholasticism exhausted as a philosophy? Had it found out all that was to be found out by its methods and on its presuppositions? *Any answer attempted to this question must be premature. An a priori answer (rather late for that now) will not do. The experiment is being tried with a new Scholasticism (therefore the old is already dead) and we must abide the result.*" Who would believe from words such as these that it is precisely of this antiquated, enfeebled, and even discarded philosophy that Sixtus and Leo and Pius have spoken in terms of supremest *present* praise?

In his horoscope, finally, of this unrecognizable remnant of the anciently glorious philosophy, the author very consistently outlines an extremely precarious future. What he considers to be its only resource is indicated by his remark that "the hope of Scholasticism as a philosophy for the future seems to rest on its alliance with Physical Science." By a further very curious association of ideas, he digresses here, and makes the future of the Church also to depend upon the same flimsy support, and envelopes it with the same hazy, benumbing atmosphere of universal doubt. He makes the remarkable assertion—though by an afterthought he throws the responsibility for it upon appearances and the popes—that "upon Scholasticism, to all appearance, so at least popes have thought, depend *in great measure* the hopes of the Roman Catholic Church *ever* recovering the ascendancy which she has lost over the intellect of mankind." The first assertion forms a sufficiently dismal prognostication concerning Scholastic Philosophy, once a noble, soaring science, but now to become, it seems, only an aproned menial in the dingy workshops of matter. The second prediction will assuredly sound strange enough to those that remember that the Church, as a specifically moral agency, finally holds and regards an ascendancy over the will, rather than over the intellect; and that its influence, accordingly, recedes or advances, not as a sequence of movement in any natural science, or of any other merely intellectual process, but in exact measure with the ebb and flow of divine charity amongst

men. We must never forget that at the helm of the Church there is an invisible Pilot who has calmed even the most turbulent of natural elements long before now, and that it has also with it a Spirit Who breatheth where He will, and before Whom all the studied contrivances of men are as nothing and all human astuteness as chaff.

But it is only in linking these two strange propositions together that their fundamentally mistaken import becomes fully apparent. If, as they declare, the future of the Church depends upon Scholastic Philosophy, and the future of Scholastic Philosophy depends upon Physical Science, it easily follows that Physical Science holds the keys to the Church's advance; a modernistic proposition of the most advanced type, and one wholly foreign to its author's real mind. But this only shows that greater care should be used in the formulation of important ideas. We in nowise yield to the author in our estimate of the influence of Scholastic Philosophy upon religious issues. This paper is written precisely because we believe it to be very great. We simply urge here the far greater importance of ideas, almost wholly obscured by this faulty presentation, but openly and explicitly voiced by Leo XIII. in this very connection. In his great encyclical, "*Aeterni Patris*," the classical papal utterance on Scholastic Philosophy, this universally erudite pontiff says, "We do not, indeed, attribute such force and authority to philosophy as to esteem it equal to the task of combating and eradicating all errors; for, when the Christian religion was first constituted, it came upon earth to restore it to its primeval dignity by the admirable light of faith, diffused not by persuasive words of human wisdom, but in the manifestation of spirit and of power; so also at the present time we look above all things to the powerful help of Almighty God to bring back to a right understanding the minds of men and dispel the darkness of error." He says, later on, that "not in vain did God set the light of reason in the human mind," a truth of primary importance and one clear to all; but it is equally important and clear that reason must always be kept in its exact, and in matters of religion always subservient, position.

We conclude our special quotations from this work with a detached passage in which the author speaks of the "late" sovereignty of the Roman States, an expression which verges very closely upon a somewhat ghastly pleasantry concerning a subject which has long been, and still is, the object of the most solemn papal protestations. In it, the author seems eager to prove to the outer world his own complete liberality and "breadth," even in a matter guarded by the solemnly standing protests of the popes. As a matter of fact,

however, this kind of conduct really proves nothing, except the eagerly and weakly surrendering character of the author's entire work in regard to things which by no means lie within his right of disposal.

The reader will, of course, judge of all these utterances for himself. A preliminary indication of our own impressions will be given by saying that popularity is not so very precious as to be prudently bought at so ruinous a price, and that, with judicious minds, contempt, not popularity, will be the only and inevitable result of the unworthy attempt.

II. QUOTATIONS FROM POPES.

In direct opposition to views so seriously depreciatory of Scholastic Philosophy, we can doubtless consider with great advantage here the utterances of another and very different class of men, the supreme pontiffs of the Church, concerning the same philosophical system. The great natural abilities of the popes, their high erudition, their world-wide avenues of information, and the lofty supernatural graces accompanying their supremely important and difficult office, surely entitle their carefully weighed and most formal judgments to the very highest respect and attention.

Commencing, naturally, with our own present reigning pontiff, it is well known that Pius X. has adopted as his own the in every way explicit and special ideas and declarations contained in the encyclical "*Aeterni Patris*" of his late illustrious predecessor, Leo XIII., one of the most intellectual of all the popes. This formal and official expression, therefore, of our highest present authority must be taken as the only legitimate standard and norm for loyal Catholic thinkers in our day. In his turn, Leo XIII., in the solemn instrument just named, quotes as forerunners of his own mind and action, Clement VI., Innocent VI., Urban V., Nicholas V., Pius V., Sixtus V., Innocent XII., Benedict XIII., Clement XII., and Benedict XIV. Of these in general, he says, "Our predecessors in the Roman Pontificate have celebrated the wisdom of Thomas Aquinas by exceptional tributes of praise and the most ample testimonials." And with greater particularity he continues, "Clement VI., Nicholas V., Benedict XIII., and others bear witness that the universal Church borrows lustre from his admirable teaching; while St. Pius V. confesses that heresies, confounded and convicted by the same teaching, were dissipated, and the whole world daily freed from fatal errors; others affirm with Clement XII. that the most fruitful blessings have spread abroad from his writings over the whole

Church, and that he is worthy of the honor which is bestowed upon the greatest doctors of the Church, on Gregory and Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome; while others have not hesitated to propose St. Thomas for the exemplar and master of the academies and great lyceums, whom they may follow with unfaltering feet. On which point the words of Blessed Urban V. to the academy of Toulouse are worthy of recall: "It is our will, which we now enjoin upon you. that ye follow the teaching of Blessed Thomas as the true and Catholic doctrine, and that ye labor with all your force to profit by the same." "Innocent XII.," he further says, "followed the example of Urban in the case of the University of Louvain, and Benedict XIV. with the Dionysian College of Granada; while to these judgments of great pontiffs on Thomas Aquinas comes the crowning testimony of Innocent VI.: 'His teaching above that of others, the canons alone excepted, enjoys such an elegance of phraseology, a method of statement, a truth of proposition, that those who hold to it are never found swerving from the path of truth, and he who dare assail it will always be suspected of error.'" After words such as these, it may be well to recall the fact that we have already shown our particular author to be very free and nonchalant in his criticisms of this same great doctor, so revered by the popes and by the entire Church. It is timely also to give in contrast Pope Leo's own estimate. "Amongst the Scholastic Doctors, the chief and master of all, towers Thomas Aquinas, who, as Cajetan observes, because 'he most venerated the ancient doctors of the Church, in a certain way seems to have inherited the intellect of all.'" "Reason, borne on the wings of Thomas to its human height, can scarcely rise higher, while faith could hardly expect more or stronger aids from reason than those which she has already obtained through Thomas." Either words such as these are false, or St. Thomas should be free from thoughtless criticism on the part of Catholic writers.

Not less precise, concerning the system as a whole, are the words in which Sixtus V., likewise quoted by Leo, enumerates the special excellences of Scholastic Philosophy. "That ready and close adherence of cause and effect, that order and array as of a disciplined army in battle, those clear definitions and distinctions, that strength of argument and those keen discussions, by which light is distinguished from darkness, the true from the false, expose and strip naked, as it were, the falsehoods of heretics wrapped round by a cloud of subterfuges and fallacies." And Leo himself, referring precisely to these words, and pointing out that, though used primarily of Scholastic Theology, they "may plainly be accepted as equally true of philosophy," continues in his own name: "Those noble

and admirable endowments, we say, are only to be found in a right use of that philosophy which the Scholastic teachers have been accustomed carefully and prudently to make use of even in theological disputations." And Leo expressly excludes innovations such as those we have been noting, for he says, "But in order that philosophy may be found equal to the gathering of these precious fruits which we have indicated, it behooves it *above all things never* to turn aside from the path which the Fathers have entered upon from a venerable antiquity, and which the Vatican Council solemnly and authoritatively approved." Still again, urging the danger of *any* departure from the system, and still further pressing its *present* use, he says, "Therefore, Venerable Brethren, . . . We think it hazardous that its special honor should not *always* remain, especially when it is established that *daily* experience, and the judgment of the greatest men, and, to crown all, the *voice of the Church*, have favored the Scholastic Philosophy." And, sad to say, men of only half-hearted obedience were not more unknown in his day than in ours; for he continues, "This new pursuit (that of novelties in philosophy) seems to have caught the souls of certain Catholic philosophers, who, throwing aside the patrimony of ancient wisdom, choose rather to build up a new edifice than to strengthen and complete the old by the aid of the new—ill-advisedly, in sooth, and not without detriment to the sciences. For a multiform system of this kind, which depends upon the authority and choice of any professor, has a foundation open to change, and consequently gives us a philosophy not firm, and stable, and robust, like that of old, but tottering and feeble." Pleading yet once more, almost as if in humble appeal, he finally says, "Our *first and most cherished* idea is that you should *all* give a generous and copious supply to studious youth of those crystal rills of wisdom flowing in a never-ending and vivifying stream from the fountain head of the Angelic Doctor." Nor was Leo as one ignorant of the present state of scientific affairs. "Nor will the physical sciences," he says, "which are now in such great repute, and by the renown of so many inventions draw such universal admiration to themselves, suffer detriment, but find very great assistance in the re-establishment of the ancient philosophy. . . . To such investigations it is wonderful what force and light and aid the Scholastic, Philosophy, if judiciously taught, would bring." "In this very age," he explicitly says, "many illustrious professors of the physical sciences openly testify that between sure and accepted conclusions of modern physics and the philosophical principles of the Schools there is no conflict worthy of the name."

With a continuity, therefore, recalling that of formal tradition,

and extending unbroken down to, and including, our own actually present times, the Holy See has steadily and unvaryingly reiterated the fact that the retention and cultivation of Scholastic Philosophy, in its genuine, original form, and especially as it is found in the works of St. Thomas, are matters that exercise a very profound influence upon the fruitful custody even of divine Revelation itself.

Surely, these are serious words of serious men; yet, as if these were not enough, the Councils themselves of the universal Church have, as Pope Leo points out, by their words and their actions, lent to the same philosophical system whatever of further sanction and weight human authority can give. And in all these utterances the point to which special attention should be given, as being of the most formal application here, is the *present, twentieth-century* fitness of Scholastic Philosophy as understood and advocated by these supreme ecclesiastical authorities.

Most of its bitterest enemies and all of its doubtful friends would readily concede that for its own deluded times and for its own former cramped and narrow circumstances, it might well be allowed to pass. But as for us, and for this supposedly enlightened age, the same classes of men can scarce bear the mention of its name. But, whatever particular persons may think, our present authorities must be our present standard; and our present pontiff, Pius X.—the pope with his heart in the tabernacle—after noting that Pope Leo had chosen St. Thomas, precisely because his teachings were of the exact kind required in our times, and after noting, moreover, that Leo had declared that our present weakness was largely due to our neglect of that great master, declares, in his own name, that, since the last period of his own pontificate had fallen upon times more hostile, perhaps, than ever before to the wisdom of the Fathers, he deems it of the very highest importance that Pope Leo's action in regard to Scholastic Philosophy should be most accurately observed and most sedulously extended.¹ He explicitly directs that "*All, whoever they may be, and in whatever part of the earth they may be situated, who teach philosophy in Catholic schools, should never depart from the way or the method of St. Thomas Aquinas, but should day by day more diligently and carefully follow in his footsteps.*"² Furthermore, in addressing the bishops in charge of the "Institute Catholique" in present-day Paris, in the very midst of the most advanced and determined hostility to everything Catholic, he says, "As for philosophy, we request that you should never allow in your seminaries any relaxed observance of the precepts

¹Acta S. Sedis, vol. XXXVI, p. 469.

²Ibid., p. 470.

most providentially given by our Predecessor. *This is a matter of great importance to the custody and safeguarding of the faith.*"³

Again, therefore, we repeat that it must be most distinctly remembered that Leo and Pius are modern popes speaking for their own times, and not for the Middle Ages; and that they are speaking, moreover, of real, genuine, Scholastic, Thomistic Philosophy, and not of its unintelligible fragments and distortions as manipulated at will by each comparatively obscure and wholly unauthorized compromiser in these smaller days. Both Leo and Pius explicitly exclude the idea that Scholastic Philosophy is something antiquated and thus useless for our times. They affirm the exact opposite, and openly declare its fitness for *all* times, as well as its *special* adaptation for our own. Indeed, their precise reason for its renewed study and application is given by themselves as its exquisite fitness to meet and refute *present* errors. Yet sad experience shows that even these repeated and most formal injunctions of close and rigid adherence to Scholastic doctrines and methods are by no means sufficient to restrain the flippant liberality which still presumes to concede and abandon, in the very face of the enemy, all that the greatest pontiffs have striven so earnestly to save.

III. QUOTATIONS CONTRASTED.

Having thus given in the exact words of their respective authors a general exposition of two very different views of Scholastic Philosophy, it now seems in place to ascertain the degree and the importance of their many discrepancies. It may be stated at once that the one, explicit purpose of the present paper is to formulate and record a most decided and emphatic protest against what is considered to be an altogether unwarranted and to the last degree injurious and deplorable surrendering of Scholastic ideals to the supposedly pressing, and certainly peremptory, demands of what is commonly known as modern scientific progress. No more fatal mistake could possibly be made. If there is any branch of knowledge in which Catholic apologists should use most especial care, that branch is philosophy. In the words of Leo XIII., "Whoso turns his attention to the bitter strifes of these days and seeks a reason for the troubles that disturb public and private life, must come to the conclusion that a fruitful cause of the evils which now afflict, as well as of those which threaten us, lies in this: that false conclusions concerning divine and human things, which originated in the schools

³ *Acta, S. Sedis*, vol. XL, p. 391.

of philosophy, have crept into all the orders of the state, and have been accepted by the common consent of the masses:"⁴ Words such as these from such a source should give liberalistic Catholic writers pause, and should lead to the most serious care in dealing with any important philosophical question. In this whole matter of philosophy, moreover, surely no other subject can be so important as the choice of an entire system and its custody when found. And it is precisely with this that the authors we are criticising professedly deal.

With regard, moreover, to the sources of present evil, any careful analysis will fully verify Pope Leo's words. Even the slightest examination of the numerous, widespread, and most destructive perversions of dogmatic and moral truth that now so afflict the Church and injure souls will show that profound philosophical errors lie close in at their bases, and, while not being their fully adequate cause, still do very much to strengthen and perpetuate them. It is, therefore, as has been said, of the very first importance that in any exposition of philosophical truth purporting to come from Catholic sources, and most especially in those intended for the general, non-Catholic public, Catholic writers should set forth the true mind of the Church with all possible clearness, force, and fidelity. Any other course can only result in degrading and injuring one of the most noble and beneficent of sciences and the most sacred of all causes, by subjecting them, as Pope Leo has indicated, to the merely capricious and often fantastic vagaries of irresponsible individual theorists.

Yet it is precisely here, in this most important work, we are extremely sorry to say, that many of the more recent works of Catholic writers most signally fail. A spirit of weak, servile concession, as unauthorized as it is injurious, pervades the whole course of many professedly defensive writings; with the inevitable and deplorable result of leaving the whole cause of Catholic truth, both philosophical and theological, in a condition much worse than it was before. We do not impugn the fundamentally good intention of these writers. We dislike very much to express even the slightest unfavorable criticism, and would be only too pleased to record an unvarying and universal commendation.

But we just as certainly feel that these ill-judged methods are extremely hurtful; that, so far from fulfilling the wishes of the popes, they are just what the popes have wished to avoid; and that these writers owe it to the great cause they represent to remember

⁴ *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XII, p. 98.

that they are not their own masters, that the sacred interests of the Church are by no means in their keeping; that, unfashionable as it may appear at present, strict obedience is a first virtue in any Catholic, and that, therefore, the only right of a subordinate Catholic teacher lies wholly within the lines laid down by the supreme Catholic teacher. His whole duty is to follow humbly and loyally the wise instructions of his divinely appointed superior.

Of course, we know that neither Scholastic Theology nor, *a fortiori*, Scholastic Philosophy is by any means the same thing as the Catholic faith; and we have not the slightest intention of demanding the dignity of dogma or the standing of infallible truth for either. Likewise, we have no idea that naturally acquired knowledge has by any means reached the utmost limit of its extension; and we simply follow in the steps of the typical Scholastics, and in the explicitly expressed wishes of the great papal advocates of Scholastic Philosophy, when we eagerly welcome whatever of really new knowledge any scientific research may attain. As a corollary, it is perfectly clear that modifications must be looked for in Scholastic Philosophy, and that, in the last analysis, the real question is as to how far these changes can properly go. But, even with all these admissions of its non-supernatural and still imperfect character, it still remains that in regard to the welfare of the Church, the question of Scholastic Philosophy is very important. We have already seen the explicit declarations of many popes to this precise effect; and if any further confirmation were needed, we could secure it very easily from a very different source and with a very different motive. In the older days, such men as Beza and Bucer owned the power of Scholastic Philosophy by saying, "If the teaching of Thomas Aquinas were only taken away, they could easily battle with all Catholic teachers, gain the victory, and abolish the Church." "A vain hope," adds Pope Leo, "but no vain testimony."⁵ In our own time the same spirit is shown on a smaller scale by such incidents as that in which the "Presbyterian General Assembly" in Ireland entered a solemn protest against the action of Belfast University in including Scholastic Philosophy in the Arts Faculty and providing a lectureship therefor. These hostile utterances undoubtedly indicate a very decided fear that the old Philosophy so long linked with the Church may again prove its powerful ally; and the instincts of heresy are only less accurate than those of the faith. And in this case both are right. The popes speak ultimately from the standpoint of faith, and Protestant synods, also, have a religious object in view;

⁵ Acta S. Sadis, vol. XII, p. 111.

so that even though, as has been said, Scholastic Philosophy is not the faith; still friend and foe do well to recognize its central position, and to reckon with its profound influence upon every advance or regression of Catholic interests. It is clear that both Scholastic Theology and Scholastic Philosophy, though distinct, are still closely allied with the faith and with each other; and that, taken together, they form the mould in which for many centuries much of the most powerful Catholic thought was cast. It further follows that both always stand peculiarly well prepared to perform their exalted office again. The faith does not change, and the specific relations of true philosophy with it are too lofty to suffer from the minor changes affecting its lower, merely physical side. The test of the centuries rejected Plato and affirmed Aristotle as the leader in arranging the rational preliminaries to revealed truth, and Scholastic Philosophy purified, elevated, and, in a certain manner, Christianized Aristotle, leaving us an inestimable treasure of exquisitely discriminating and powerful thought closely allied to religious refinements, and thus far too precious for ill-considered treatment or thoughtless abandonment.

IV. DESTRUCTIVE.

In any case, it is perfectly certain that any system whatsoever, be it theological or philosophical, must retain its essential features, if it is to live at all and justify its name. Not infrequently, the defenders of a system, in seeking to commend it by dissecting away what they deem objectionable or useless, include the most vital parts in their complacent but disastrous surgery. Scholastic Philosophy, at least, has certainly suffered very much of late by these clumsily well-intentioned methods. Its defenders seem to have become thoroughly frightened by the persistent and peremptory clamors of second or third rate scientific writers, and they seem to feel that their only resource is to remove at once, and at any cost, all those features of the system which are especially displeasing to so-called modern minds. Their humble hope is that the lifeless remainder may be so presented to the modern world as to ensure its at least partial and precarious acceptance. Just what would be gained by this disastrously conditioned acknowledgment, is by no means clear; but it is perfectly certain that no professed enemy could injure the system to any degree approaching that inflicted by these, its inconsiderate, incompetent friends. One of these latter self-justifyingly observes that "it (Scholastic Philosophy) is irreformable, to a Catholic, only so far as its conclusions happen to coincide

with dogmas taught by the Church." This is true enough from a specifically religious standpoint; but it should be borne in mind that a certain amount of reforming, while not constituting any infringement of Catholic faith, may, nevertheless constitute a very great offence against Scholastic Philosophy; so much so, as completely to destroy the entire system.

In this case, we submit that a Scholastic Philosophy possessing no definite, presently ascertainable value, and fundamentally injured in its foremost exponent, in its Cosmology, in its Psychology, and in its Theodicy, is simply not Scholastic Philosophy at all; that the disingenuous title of "Neo-Scholasticism" does nothing to conceal its essentially altered character; that, as we have said, so far from being what the popes desire, it is precisely what they are seeking to avoid; and that the authors of passages such as we have quoted—and they are only too numerous—have no right to place the word "Scholasticism" in their title, or to declare in their prefaces that they believe in it. For our own part, we refuse just as frankly to accept them as framers of a new philosophy for the Church. Their manner and method are by no means reassuring; for they are rudely and most unwarrantably presumptuous with the friends of the system, but most thoroughly humble and abject before its enemies. As we have said, the hope of these writers is placed, not in a genuine Scholastic Philosophy, but in a meaningless "Neo-Scholasticism," which they have themselves arbitrarily and capriciously sketched at the severest expense of the older system. On the other hand, the greatest popes have been, and are, striving most earnestly for the restoration of real Scholasticism; a most questionable proceeding, if its spent and tottering infirmity and decrepitude as depicted by these later writers have any objective reality. Certainly, a Scholasticism such as they present to our view would be but a sorry and ridiculous object of such earnest zeal and such reiterated solicitude. One of these self-appointed and self-guided apologists somewhat unctuously remarks that "there is no impiety in the idea of a Neo-Scholasticism." We agree with him. It is more like homicide.

V. UNAUTHORIZED.

Perhaps the best antidote for this fear and this foolishness would be found by these writers in the reflection that they are dealing summarily with, and, as far as in them lies, disposing of by destroying, something very precious which is not their own. "By what authority," we ask, does any private writer, professing to in-

interpret Catholic convictions to the outside world, proceed, in the very face and full knowledge of so many papal decrees, to so mutilate Scholastic Philosophy that it could no longer justly bear the name? Leo XIII. knew perfectly well that mutilation would be attempted. He knew that small men with this abject, obsequious spirit of concession to imaginary modern demands would be certain, in his own and other ages, to tarnish even the inestimable work of the Church's all but inspired sages; and he did what he could to restrict and restrain their never wholly repressible activity. "But," he says in the same great Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, "lest the false for the true, or the corrupt for the pure, be drunk in, be ye watchful that the doctrine of Thomas be drawn from his own fountains, or at least from those rivulets which, derived from the very fount, have thus far flowed, according to the established agreement of learned men, pure and clear; be careful to guard the minds of youth from those which are said to flow thence, but in reality are gathered from strange and unwholesome streams." It is perfectly certain that no man of the mental calibre of the great popes we have quoted would be at all tolerant of any surrender of the system's essential features. If Scholastic Philosophy is so very imperfect, and if it is merely tentative, these great men are inexplicably eager for its restoration. It is inconceivable that such men as the erudite Benedict XIV. or the brilliant Leo XIII. or the sternly uncompromising Pius X. would be otherwise than severely indignant at the use of their names in connection with the travesties of Scholastic Philosophy which some recent Catholic writers presume to offer their readers. The very convenient laxity which calmly assumes personal superiority and consequently interprets papal decrees according to personal bias, is really an insult to supreme authority; and it results, as it is intended to do, in a practical nullification of all the Holy See's care and all its most deeply considered directions. This practically unlimited personal independence is, indeed, very fashionable in the world of today; but that fact does not give it a place amongst Catholic scholars in our own, any more than in any other, age.

VI. IGNORANT.

But hostility and opposition to the known wishes of legitimately constituted authority is not the only undesirable feature of this spirit of excessive concession. It is really based on ignorance, and can only rest in a mind fundamentally failing to grasp the entire nature and setting of the philosophical system now known as "Scholastic." On the part of our excessively compromising advocates, Scholastic

Philosophy is so timidly brought forth, mainly because they, and the world around them, consider it an exclusively Catholic system, bound up by an accommodating, unnatural alliance with the truths of faith, and with a misty, antiquated, and wholly unphilosophical cast and habit of mind, which dogmatized where it could, and took refuge in evasive verbiage wherever definite declarations were clearly impossible. Many are at heart ashamed of it, on the vague, half-confessed ground that it is, on the whole, purely cloistral and religious, and, as such, utterly unfit for our days, and necessarily narrow and even distorted and unfair, through being thus specialized and adapted for a pre-ordained service merely as a preliminary preparation and subsequent support for Scholastic Theology.

But a little calm investigation will show that we have here a most remarkable phenomenon, and one very rare in history; that is, there is here presented a deforming effect of religious prejudice incomparably more profound and perduring than even that most acrid and acidic of narrownesses is ordinarily able to produce. Persistent, indiscriminate and quasi-synonymous condemnations of Catholic faith and of Scholastic Philosophy have so linked these two in less critical minds as effectually to obscure, if not wholly obliterate, the essential distinction which must always remain between them, and to even more completely conceal the ancient Greek origin of the latter, and the necessarily world character of a system spanning twenty-two centuries of consecutive life on the world's widest plains of philosophical thought. While, moreover, its specifically ecclesiastical affiliations do not antedate the thirteenth century, combined ignorance and prejudice have procured the sufficiently curious result of successfully representing as Catholic a philosophy which existed three times as long outside the Church, as it has within it. But history remains, and prejudice passes away; and it is at last beginning to dawn upon the minds of men that the system called "Scholastic" is, in very truth, a world-system of the most indubitable character; that it is, in fact, the *only* world-system that we really possess. In its specific, fundamental principles, it had existed three centuries before Christ came; and had thus lived a life as long as that of Cartesianism, and twice as long as that of Kantism or Hegelianism, before the Church had even begun to exist. For sixteen centuries, it flourished in the keen schools of the Eastern Arabic nations and in those of their not less acute descendants in southwestern Europe, before it entered specifically to any appreciable extent into Western philosophico-theological thought; a period and a career surely sufficient to give it a determinate character, independent of all other relations. Within the Church, its distinctively effective life may be

said to have ended with the eighteenth century; so that its whole active existence includes sixteen centuries outside of the Church and five within its schools; a ratio of less than one in three. If, moreover, we were to regard only the time in which it acquired and typically retained the name "Scholastic," we should find that this period comprises only two centuries; a ratio of only one in eight. Clearly, if origin and associations are, after the modern manner, to be taken as standards, this great system of philosophy has much greater claims upon those outside the Church than upon those within it. Aristotle was its real author, and he lived and died in the fourth century before Christ; while St. Thomas, who first brought the system to full Scholastic perfection, lived and labored within the span of the thirteenth century of our era. Even the works of Aristotle came fully into the possession of Western scholars only through a Latin translation effected in St. Thomas' time.

A most important additional consideration in this regard is the fact that in its antecedent and extra-ecclesiastical life, the great philosophy of which we are speaking was the chosen philosophy of the most acute peoples and minds of the world. It was the very flower of exalted Grecian thought, and it formed the especial delight of the subtle Arabic mind. The great Socrates and the greater Plato had preceded, and Aristotle, the prince of thinkers for all time, and one seemingly raised up by God to prove how much unaided reason can do, retained whatever of value his predecessors possessed, added the incomparably greater treasures of his own profound speculations, and, in the splendid power of his master mind, co-ordinated and synthesized the whole into the immortal system which through all the ages has borne the imperishable honor of his single name. Polished Greek, mystic Hebrew, and calculating Arab later pored and pondered deeply over the inexhaustible treasures of profoundest and sublimest thought which the world's greatest genius had thus left them; and almost equally inexhaustible derivations of utmost refinement and power were the result of their secular labors.

We do not say that all of Aristotle's ideas were true, or that all of his commentators were men free from error. Human conditions do not permit so much. We are seeking primarily here to record anew and to emphasize the undoubted historical fact that the Aristotelian system of philosophy, adequately considered, is Catholic only by adoption and adaptation; by an adaptation, moreover, that was perfective, not destructive; and that its typically ecclesiastical life may justly be deemed but an episode in its wondrously extended career. It is wholly erroneous, therefore, to consider it as even specifically ecclesiastical in its nature or origin, and any conception limit-

ing it to Catholic thought can only be held under penalty of complete mental obscurity concerning its ancient pagan origin and its long and brilliant extra-Catholic history. A further inference, therefore, and one especially desired here, is that which marks the pitifully erroneous and mistaken position of those Catholic writers who have only Catholic reasons for minimizing and excusing Scholastic Philosophy, or who even wish to minimize and excuse it at all. They are wholly oblivious, as their methods prove, of its lofty and exquisite beauty, and of its as yet unshaken world bases.

This unparalleled philosophy at once modern, Scholastic, Arabic, Aristotelian and Grecian, when adequately understood and appreciated, will be seen to be incomparably more imposing than any other conceivably rival system. Those who deride it, therefore, if they ever study it sufficiently to understand it, must reckon with adversaries who never owned any ecclesiastical allegiance, as well as with those who consistently bore religion's highest insignia; and in both they will find most formidable opponents and men wholly unaccustomed to defeat. Beside their towering intellects, our pseudo, upstart scientists of an hour are the veriest pygmies; and the magnificent philosophy of all the ages will require something more for its definite downfall than the raillery or the neglect of minds really ignorant of its true nature and history, and wholly incompetent to deal successfully with its profound investigations and results. It has borne the fiery test of twenty-two centuries of severest assay, under the merciless scrutiny of the most powerful minds. The crucible was strong, and the fires unceasing; yet the fierce trial did but purge the dross more fully away, and the indestructible gold of its truth did but acquire a purer lustre from the age-long ordeal; so that despite the shallow clamor of its enemies and the much more injurious apathy or injudicious interest of its nominal friends, this great philosophical system still stands first as man's natural verdict upon his surroundings. If Catholic writers would only more promptly and more loyally obey the Church that knows the centuries, they would become much more profiting and profitable children of their venerable, profoundly prudent Mother.

Before concluding this view of the subject, it may be well to cast a passing glance upon the history of the system in its more specifically religious surroundings; and here it will be found that a list of the great churchmen who either implicitly or explicitly possessed and developed its fundamental tenets in their own right, or perfected and adapted its already known *dicta*, would include all the greatest names in the Church. In addition to their Greco-Arabian life, the basic principles of Scholasticism had lived *in re*, though not in name,

even in the earlier, unformed, and half Platonic philosophico-theological system that has been called "Augustinianism"; and any examination of its intra-ecclesiastical efficacy would show that whether in the hands of an Augustine or a Leo its merciless logic has ever been the severely juridic tribunal before which not even the most specious of heresies could hope to stand. It has long both illustrated, and been illustrated by, the faith, its superior ally; and has thus gradually and solidly acquired a perfection of adaptation to the rational needs of the Church such as no other system can hope to possess without a similarly long discipline of centuries. The friends of the faith are, therefore, already condemning their labors to the most serious retardation, whenever, in the rational treatment of questions accompanying faith, they allow an even partial indifference or neglect to characterize their action regarding this tried and successful associate in all the greater polemical struggles of the Church.

To continue—for the chapter "On Misconceptions" will always be tediously long—the fact should be noted that Scholastic Philosophy was never as a thing formally tried upon its own merits, and as formally found wanting and condemned. The very perfection to which it had risen warned later generations that they could hardly hope to equal, and could not, in general, hope to surpass, the imposingly great masters who had gone before. The minds of men consequently and naturally turned with greater eagerness to the newer and less difficult lines of investigation made possible by ever multiplying mechanical advances. It is, moreover, a very great mistake to search for thoroughly rational and consistent causes for every human phenomenon. Neither nations nor individuals always act judiciously. We all remember that when the less noble, but more popular, Themistocles wished to banish the upright Aristides, one, at least, of the fellow-citizens of the latter voted for the decree, through mere weariness at hearing this incorruptible Athenian continually called "The Just"; and whimsical voters are never alone in this world. The decree was actually carried, and subsequent history is not without parallel records. Children, too, very often change their ideals and their occupations, not only without reason, but also against it; and nations not less than men are often but children of a larger growth and more cultured perversity. Giving the one great reason for the comparative decline in power of Aristotelico-Scholastic Philosophy in the centuries succeeding its golden age, we must turn to the fact of greater mechanical dexterity which led men to the world and the mass of matter in which we now immersed; and the comparative failure of the great system in these later days

is not our glory but our shame. It never merited this ignoble treatment. Like all human knowledge, past, present, and to come, it was certainly still susceptible of further extension and refinement; but in the hands of its real exponents it was always abreast of its times, and, properly treated, it is still equal to every advance.

In particular, it never merited the principal, because most convenient and plausible, taunt of modern critics, that, namely, of being wholly a *prioristic* and abstract, and, as such, having little, if any, connection with vital, daily, experimental fact. When the proper distinctions are made as to the real and the less typical Schoolmen, and as to the branches of study which permit or exclude physical manipulations, the real truth is that Scholastic Philosophy is seen to be, by its very nature, and in the hands of its originators and highest exponents, a science of experiment wherever experiment is possible. Aristotle differs from Plato, precisely because he subjects his mental generalizations to a closer test with nature; and it was this very fact that caused him to supplant Plato in the favor of the Church and of the Schools. It would be simply ridiculous to complain that the Scholastic did not conduct physical experimentation as we know it now. The then rudimentary condition of the mechanical arts rendered this utterly and completely impossible. He is the very poorest of philosophers, who would judge an earlier epoch by his own, and exact from it results rendered possible only by the slow advance of centuries. The true philosophical temper was present in the more representative Scholastics, and to the limited extent then possible, both physics and metaphysics had each its special field, as well as its proper relation with the other. In those branches, finally, in which ordinary, external experimentation and testing were, and are, and always will be, out of the question, and in which, therefore, the ancient and the modern investigator stand on equal ground, such as, for instance, in the higher reaches of Rational Psychology, the true Aristotelians and Scholastics are easily the superiors of any of their successors, and in these branches they elaborated systems incomparably more coherent and consistent than those of later date. Cremona violins are not the only soft-sighing reminders of the lost arts of ancient days.

Let him who cares to do so proclaim the superiority of the modern, materialistic sepulchre of thought in which we are now entombed over the heaven-piercing minarets of Italian and of Grecian intellectuality. For our part, we prefer always to remember that man's soul is nobler than his body; his mind, more noble than its material environment; and for us the sorrow shall be, not

that we lack the acclaim of the new, but that we do not more fully possess the fadeless beauty and the invincible power of the old.

VII. ILL-ADVISED.

But besides being unauthorized and ill-founded, this spirit of practically entire concession is ill-directed and ill-advised. It takes the world at its own word, and proceeds on the supposition that the Scholastic system is really understood, and that the difficulties urged against it are really and truly intellectual; whereas most of its critics know Scholastic Philosophy only by name, and in the vast majority of cases, the real obstacle is not in the intellect, but in the will. The vicissitudes of specifically Scholastic Philosophy have followed, not anteceded, those of the Church; and the historical coincidence of their various phases was not accidental. As in the case of the faith itself, the opposition to Scholastic Philosophy has, in general, been malicious, where it was not ignorant. Men determined to reject the yoke of Christ are not going to accept a rigorous philosophy which inexorably deprives them of any reason for so doing. It is folly to treat as cool and quiet judges men who are hopelessly hostile, through personal interest, to the cause that is to be brought before them. In the outer world, as in the inner, Scholastic Philosophy is not, and never will be, wholly separated from Scholastic Theology; and this will always complicate its case; for it is really the reflex, theological consequences that a bridleless world so consistently fears.

Considerations such as these will readily remove the very serious ambiguity which always lurks under the favorite formula of appealing to, and trying to win the approval of "modern science." Upon a first view and unexamined, this inoffensive seeming formula would indicate the existence of some impartial, judicious tribunal to which Scholastic Philosophy could have recourse with a solid hope of recognition for its claims, in the event of their proving true. But upon reflection it will be seen that to "appeal to modern science," in the sense intended here, can mean nothing else than an appeal concerning the highest and most difficult metaphysical questions made to the philosophically undisciplined, materialistic, and self-opinionated men whom the world of today chooses to regard as the leaders in modern physical research; to men, therefore, wholly incompetent for so difficult a task, and men, moreover, with all their own favorite theories to maintain, and with numberless extraneous prejudices due to social, political, and religious environment tending to still further warp their already ill-disposed minds, and lead them to hold aloof from, and to reject, a philosophy whose lofty and

exacting requirements would at once reduce them to their proper insignificance in the real world of thought.

This present temper of the world at large may be almost palpably apprehended in the fact that even mere Theism in its most attenuated form, provided only that it retain some really intelligible meaning, is at once rejected by modern philosophers; for if there is one persistent, concordant note in present day philosophical systems, it is that which eliminates any really personal God, and thus than the most pitiable folly, verging upon complete imbecility, for destroys every idea of a being really supreme; and it is nothing less the representatives of Catholicism to stand with their heaven-aspiring, God-declaring system of philosophy, humbly begging for its recognition at the hands of men who are determined to make themselves the standard and the rule of all things, in order to be free in all. Something more than a diluted dose of Scholastic—or any other—philosophy is needed in the case of men to whom no other name is so bitterly odious as that of the One God in Three Persons whose truth forces them back to their proper subservient position. Truth, whether natural or supernatural, requires a pure and upright heart, as well as an unbiased mind, for its full and fruitful reception. "Wisdom will not enter into a malicious soul, nor dwell in a body subject to sins" is true in its proper degree, of both orders of cognition. Stern, unyielding philosophical truth will be popular, when inexorable religious realities are popular; not before. The lofty truth and beauty of Scholastic Philosophy are precisely its undoing. As long as its all but inspired maxims are as true and as noble as they are, so long shall it knock in vain at the doors of an obstinate, grovelling world; and the bitterness of the contumely sought to be cast upon it will be the measure of its hated superiority. The Church might well adapt to itself and its faithful associate the words of Christ to His disciples, "If the world hate you, know you that it hath hated me before you." The world's cancer is in its heart, not in its brain. Its lips, not its eyes, are foul, else it would not have sin, and they shall never speak in higher truth, till touched by an angel with heaven's own deep-cleansing fires. Man's real regeneration must commence in the sanctuary, not in the laboratory; and the Christian apologist who places his principal hope in his humbly tapping at the halls of modern physical research with the ulterior hope of winning the materialistic experimenters to the Church by a degraded form of Scholastic Philosophy is ridiculously unworthy of both the great causes he seeks to represent. We know that popes have desired the return and the vigor of Scholastic ideals, on the ground that their coming would aid in the great spiritual work

of the Church; and we most fully share this thought and this feeling. But these utterances must be rightly understood; and if they are, they will be seen to apply to the higher and nobler branches of philosophy, and to have but little real connection with the philosophy of matter which is now almost the only form known to the world at large. The popes have, indeed, summoned right reason to its tasks; but this has been done only in order not to neglect those human powers which God has given us, and which He expects us to use. The hopes of the pontiffs, as heads of the Church, have always regarded the heart rather than the intellect; and thus their interest in the more remote and material sciences, as such, must always remain to a great degree subordinate and secondary. As a scientist, the Church knows that, absolutely speaking, the intellect must lead in human affairs; but as a practical moral agency, it also knows that in the masses of the people the movements of the will generally determine those of the mind, and thus become the really ultimate, *de facto* arbiters of human destiny. Our author, as the reader may recall, indicated that to a great degree the hopes of the Church depended "to all appearance" upon Scholasticism; but it should be remembered that, as has been proved more than once, appearances count but for very little in the history of the Church. Divine Providence often chooses to place strength just where human astuteness would discern only weakness; and we venture to believe that none of the great papal advocates of Scholastic Philosophy ever looked to it in any principal manner for the advances of the Church.

As a result of their proper and unchangeable relation, the Church will never come second in any Scholastic revival. She will always come first. The Church will not profit so much from Scholasticism as Scholasticism will profit from the Church. It was the Church that brought Scholasticism to its highest beauty, and if it is living now, in this degraded, unthinking phase of the world's history, it owes its continued life largely to the Church. Truth always finds an easy pathway when the heart is properly disposed; and, as far as any efficient results are concerned, the salutary changing of the human heart has ever been the exclusive work of the Church. If the so-called "learned" world were to become honest tomorrow, the triumph of sound philosophy would be an accomplished fact. And until the leaders of thought do become really and humbly honest, we shall labor in vain, if we labor solely or principally with merely natural means. The first requisite for Catholic apologists is to understand the real situation, and to meet it squarely. And it seems to us that if they do, they will spare themselves the useless humiliation of paring down the merely physical

side of Scholastic Philosophy, in order to commend it to men who have something very different and vastly more important in their minds.

VIII. ESPECIALLY ILL-TIMED.

At the present time especially, it would be peculiarly regrettable and costly for Catholic writers to bend before the studiously cultivated prejudices of the later, "reform" centuries; because in the highest realms of scientific study, and in the sanest minds of the present day, many of the most striking discoveries are causing the select few amongst scientists to recall the great Schoolmen, and to treat with sincerest respect a philosophy long subject to fashionable contempt and derision, as being hopelessly antiquated and wholly effete. Anyone familiar with the present literature of even physical science must have noticed its repeated references to Scholastic formulae as being, perhaps, the most logical expression for now known facts. And it is precisely in obedience to this irresistible tendency of the most truly modern minds, and in consonance with this widely re-awakening scientific interest in Scholastic Philosophy, and under penalty, therefore, of otherwise lagging behind the times, that Oxford and other great non-Catholic universities are replacing the works of St. Thomas and the other Schoolmen more or less formally upon their lists of studies and lectureships, and are recommending their study to their candidates for special honors. It would be most stupid and costly for Catholics alone to ignore the new lustre of doctrines now again forcing their way to respect; and under present circumstances, no words could properly characterize the folly of being so eager to mutilate and surrender them. Yet this very eagerness is an undoubted, present-day fact with regard to Catholic writers. Catholics are by no means so alert as they should be in this spreading and undoubtedly forward movement in favor of the Church's philosophy, or in its renewed scientific study. Yet, even the study of strangers cannot but remove some of the blemishes with which prejudiced calumny has so long continued to disfigure it; and it may even be, as it has been before, that an alien hand will strike off the last incrustations of unjust reproach, and allow its deathless beauty to flash forth again as splendid as before.

Even if, moreover, this renewed scientific regard were absent, the merely tentative possibilities of present science renders it wholly unnecessary to surrender any even fairly well supported thesis, Scholastic or otherwise. Even the very accommodating writer whose work has seemed so completely unsatisfactory to us admits that we

"have not yet analyzed material substance into its essential components in detail"; and again—where, also, we are with him—"Even to the end of time the ultimate nature of things seems likely to remain a mystery. Who shall finally say what is electricity or what is life?" Whereupon we likewise ask, "Why, then, such haste in practically abandoning Scholastic, or any other coherent, ideas concerning these ultimate entities?" Within the limits naturally to be presupposed here, it can be securely said that we cannot say what matter is not, until we can say what it is; and if this latter is to remain forever unknown, Scholastic theories, or any others not palpably absurd, have ample time to beat an at least dignified retreat. Under the real circumstances at present existing, the unseemly haste of some Catholic philosophers to explain themselves away concerning these non-solvable matters must likewise remain a wholly inexplicable natural phenomenon.

Again—to review in haste some of the tenets noted before—what could be more confused than present-day Psychology, the professed "Psychology of the Flux?" Why, then, essay the unnecessary and utterly hopeless task of accommodating the at least approximately consistent and coherent Scholastic science of soul and mind to vague and disordered present-day ideals? It is, further, no secret, even amongst the most modern of scientists, that the real, inner nature of gravitation is wholly unknown; yet one of the authors we have in mind gravely dogmatizes, for anti-scholastic reasons, about what is, and is not, accidental in it; in order, we presume, to show his liberality, and incidentally to invalidate St. Thomas' argument from motion for the existence of God. Later on, he becomes benevolent, even towards St. Thomas, and says, "If we pass from motion to the energies of the universe, and invoke the principle of the conservation of energy—then more may be made of the argument." But we really wonder whether or not the author knows that in passing from motion to its causes, that is, to the "energies of the universe," scientific difficulties increase almost *in infinitum*. As for the principle of the conservation of energy, it would doubtless have been very interesting to the author to have sat between Lord Kelvin and Becquerel at the banquet given in honor of the latter at Florence, and to have heard the great English generalizer, incomparably the greatest, most Newton-like, and synthetic of modern world-scientists, observe that the French savant's results had placed the first interrogation point after this same "principle of the conservation of energy"; and it might interest him still further to consult Whetham's "Recent Development of Physical Science," where he would find that this interrogation point has grown into what that author calls, "Lord

Kelvin's great principle of the *Dissipation* of energy." It is true that this particular expression is limited by its context to "available" energy; but it is also true that the total dissipation of available energy would render all motion impossible, and thus eliminate the argument of St. Thomas. In any case, as the same author points out, "Energy may *seem to be conserved* in the conditions known to us. . . . *It does not follow*, however, that conditions unknown to us may not exist, in which . . . energy might disappear or come into existence." Again, "While fully recognizing the importance of these generalizations (the conservation of mass and that of energy) from the physical point of view, we must be careful how we give them any metaphysical significance." But everyone knows that the argument of St. Thomas essentially includes metaphysical considerations. To quote once more from the same author, "The conservation of mass and energy under all known conditions is a valid metaphysical argument in favour of the view that our ideas of them correspond with ultimate realities, but it is no more than an argument; it deserves due weight, but is not conclusive evidence." Clearly, Whetham, at least, would not be much impressed by the addition of the "conservation of energy" to the original argument of St. Thomas.

Le Bon, also, and Sir Oliver Lodge, men known to all, speak of both the evolution and of the dissipation of matter, in terms implying that, in the one case, energy is the terminus *a quo*, and in the other, the terminus *ad quem* of these processes; in both of which the conservation of energy, in the sense intended by our present author, would fail of verification. If we are to prop up Scholastic Philosophy with modern lumber, at least let the new beams be not more disastrously cracked than the old. Those inclined to be over obsequious towards modern "science" might well ponder the following words of the late Lord Kelvin: "One word characterizes the most strenuous of the efforts for the advancement of science that I have made perseveringly for fifty-five years; that word is failure. I know no more of electric or magnetic force, or of the relation between ether, electricity, and ponderable matter, or of chemical affinity than I knew and tried to teach my class-students in my first session as professor."

In dismissing finally this to the last degree superficial and unsatisfactory manner of dealing with most important and significant studies, we pause to record our lingering curiosity as to just what the author conceives to be "the atomic theory as it stands today," how he defends the looseness of the assertion—said to be a truism for us—that "Metaphysics . . . have absolutely nothing to do with

Astronomy"; also just "how much Suarez had to learn from the modern physicist." Some certainly modern scientists would unceremoniously say that the atomic system simply does not stand at all; that it has fallen not to rise again; and even those who accord it a modified existence have very many and very conflicting methods of explaining it. We know the author's meaning in regard to Metaphysics and Astronomy. It is the loose and, in itself, misleading form of expression that we criticise. As for Suarez, his coarser material and data would certainly need revision; but it is still to be proved that his fundamental concepts concerning matter were not fully equal to any we now possess.

Et idem dic de aliis non paucis. The same must be said of the other, and even most recent, branches of physical science. The one, ever-present, all-pervading note of ultra-modern scientific research is that of its uncertain, confused, and chaotic character. We do not here indicate a chaos of darkness and vacuous ignorance, but of an overwhelmingly numerous and baffling array of newly ascertained, but not as yet properly correlated or co-ordinated, facts. It is certain that Scholastic Philosophy offers quite as good a basis for this delayed arrangement and classification as any other. Why, then, destroy it by mutilation in our haste to be obsequious and "modern"? We know, of course, that many fancies of the Middle Ages must be forever relegated to the realms of Poetry and Rhetoric; but in this depurating process, we must remember that we are nurses, not anatomists. We repeat that non-Catholic interests have noticed and obeyed the irresistibly Scholastic trend of the times, that it would be pitifully foolish and costly for Catholics alone to ignore or oppose it, and that, therefore, the present tendency of many to do so is peculiarly uncalled-for and especially ill-timed.

IX. THE FUTURE.

But, it need not be said, the real, practical question is, "What is Scholastic Philosophy to be, what is its probable future?" In answer, we are happy to agree with those who hold that its most proper and profitable proximate task is that of allying its own deep deductive processes with the present exquisitely exact inductive investigations of modern physico-chemical research; its nobler and truer destiny still being, as before, the detection, examination, and lofty development of the great universal and ontological bases of the cosmos, and of the vast consequences of primary facts. The preliminary alliance here indicated is in every way feasible, and in the highest degree desirable. The richest scientific fruits have al-

ways been secured by the intimate union of accurate experimental research and correctly applied metaphysical principles. The present philosophical temper of the better elements of the scientific world absolutely demands this naturally suggested close co-operation of sense and intellect; and justly so, for right reason most evidently dictates the harmonious use of our entire cognitive power, wherever this is possible. We have seen, moreover, that amongst the higher and saner scientists, Scholastic Philosophy has already regained some of its lost prestige, and if we but do our part, this inestimable presage of the triumph of truth will not prove illusory.

The task awaiting the real Scholastic philosopher of our day is, therefore, as has been well said, great, indeed. Scholastic Philosophy alone constitutes a most formidable object for even the most assiduous and painstaking study; and modern physical science, like a spreading mass of protoplasm, has so multiplied its delicate articulations that no one man can hope to become an expert in all its branches. Yet the true philosopher of our day must effect an at least comparatively exhaustive analysis of each and a relatively perfect synthesis of both; an outline of labor truly Herculean in its extent and arduous character.

But though the task is great, it is not inherently impossible; and, as has again been suggested, until the great genius shall come whose powerful grasp will force the vast, swiftly gathering masses of positive and negative scientific data into their naturally intimate union, and shall thus elicit, in one splendid instant, the wide white flash of truth from their reciprocal reaction, and with it illumine from pole to pole the whole vast firmament of human cognition, and explain much that is veiled to us now—until he shall have come, it will, indeed, be well, as a recent writer suggests, for all real lovers of learning to work honestly and fearlessly together, and thus supply to some extent that which nature has so long denied to any one, individual brain. All Catholic scholars, however, engaged in **this great work** should be most careful never to forget the primary principle that, **whatever his other qualities may be**, the soldier who is not generously and sincerely loyal to his chief is always a menace and a peril to the entire army and to even the most sacred of causes.

DANIEL A. DEVER,

Overbrook, Pa.

HOW ENGLAND BECAME PROTESTANT.

THE question is often asked, and, to many Catholics appears, humanly speaking, unanswerable: How did England, which, for a thousand years, not counting the British period, had been conspicuous for her loyalty to the Holy See, become, in half a century, or even less, the bitter enemy of the Catholic Church? What were the causes which led the whole nation, for it amounts to that, to change its spiritual allegiance from Pope to King; to defame the Vicar of our Lord as Anti-Christ, the man of sin; the True Faith, to which England owed her glory, her greatness, her very existence, as "Popish idolatry," hateful to God and men; the Church of the living God as the mother of abominations? Chiefly, and above all, how came the leaders of this revolt to persuade men and women, honestly to believe their teaching as the very Gospel of God?

The question, in some one of these forms, is, like so many others, more easily asked than answered. To the majority of Catholics, to those, especially, who have not, consciously, come under the influence of the so-called reformation, it appears, as I have said, simply insoluble by any human method of reasoning. It is, for them, as, indeed, for all of us, a mystery of Divine Providence. I will go further still, and admit, Englishman as I am, that it was a manifest judgment on the national pride and self-will, on the cowardly love of life, of those who, from whatever motives, suffered themselves to be led or driven from the one fold into the desert of heresy and schism. Most of all, is it a manifest judgment on the spiritual and temporal leaders of the English people, to whom the great mass of the nation looked, confidently, as their natural guides, and who so flagrantly betrayed their trust. "As for these sheep, what have they done?"

I shall not, as I need hardly say, attempt an answer that can, in any sense, be accepted as such. That has been done, so far as it is possible for a non-Catholic to do it, by Professor Gardner, in his "Lollardy and the Reformation in England." I shall, however, take as a primary principle, even as he has, that England did not deny, but was forcibly robbed of her ancient faith. For the rest, I shall content myself with endeavoring to suggest some, at least, of the causes which must be taken into account; some of the reasons which may, humanly speaking, be assigned for what is essentially a mystery of Divine Providence, even as it is held to be.

What here follows is, therefore, rather an attempt to give the general impression conveyed, to my own mind, by a careful study of

the work just referred to, and of such other literature of the subject as has come within my reach, than the series of quotations, and of references to authorities, which any fuller or more exact treatment of the subject would necessarily involve.

The predisposing causes, then, as they may be called, of such a change of spiritual allegiance, must be sought not merely in the politico-religious conditions of the times in which it occurred, in what is commonly termed the reformation period, still less must the search for them be confined to those conditions as existing in England only. The revolt of England from the divine authority of the Holy See, was, in the first place, part of a general movement, affecting many nations and countries; the ultimate causes, to define them somewhat more exactly, being the same in all cases. The immediate, differential causes, fall, so to speak, into the second place, modified, as they were, by racial characteristics and political exigences. How important these were, however, may be judged by comparing the origins and course of the movement in England, with those evident in the case of Scotland. Still more, one may say, by comparing the reformation in England with the reformation in Flanders or Germany.

Among the ultimate remoter causes, the most important was, unquestionably, the State of Christendom in the century preceding the reformation. The rival claims, the intrigues, excommunications, and counter-excommunications of two, and sometimes three, aspirants to the Chair of Peter, the assertion, by a General Council, of jurisdiction over the Vicar of Christ, of the members over the head tended inevitably to lower the dignity of the papacy in the eyes of a wondering and distracted Christendom. How could an office be of divine appointment, concerning which none knew who was the rightful holder of it? How could it be divine in the persons of some who exercised it?

To this primary source of all the evils that were soon to fall on the Church, must be added the laxity of morals which affected clergy and laity alike, bringing religion itself into contempt. "The whole head is sick, the whole heart is faint; from the sole of the foot unto the crown of the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores." Indeed, I would almost venture to say that the degradation of the papacy was as much an effect of this condition as a cause of it. If it be true, as Carlyle says, that men always have the rulers they deserve, is it not true of the Church, as consisting of ordinary men and women?

The testimony on which all this is founded is, it may be said, that of prejudiced and unreliable witnesses, such as Erasmus, or

of over-zealous reformers, in the real sense. If so, how account for all that occurred? God's chastisements, it is true, fall no less heavily on those He loves, as on His enemies; often, so far as we can see, even more heavily. Yet we may surely assume that He sees sufficient cause; that the best of His loved ones need to be called back to Himself. "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent."

It is well, then, that we should take for granted the conditions described as affecting the Church immediately prior to the reformation; since the very summoning of the Council of Trent shows how clearly the Church recognized the need of real reform. When, therefore, men prized orthodoxy of profession over personal piety or purity of life; when they "took tithe of mint, anise and cummin, and neglected the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and truth," the decay of faith followed, as surely and as inevitably as night follows day. "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax faint." If the thirteenth century was, indeed, the greatest age of the Church, the fourteenth certainly witnessed her utmost degradation. Her losses in the fifteenth and sixteenth were but her purging, "so as by fire," whence she has arisen, purified, humbled, yet strengthened, with a promise of even greater glory than of old.

These two causes, the decay of morals and the degradation of the papacy, were common to the reformation movement, as a whole. They were, as I have said, the sources whence it sprang; which made it spiritually possible. A corrupt, unchaste priesthood, a relaxed monasticism, a temporal papacy, striving and striven for like any earthly monarchy, what better charges could the ingenuity of Satan himself have devised to lead weak, doubting souls to believe that Christ's promise to His Church had come to naught and that the gates of hell had prevailed against her? When the shepherds turned to hirelings, what should the sheep do, but wander and be scattered?

Coming, now, to the causes which specially affected England, we must, at the outset, take into account one which, perhaps, had been lost sight of or not sufficiently weighed, till Abbot Gasquet drew attention to it. This is the losses suffered by secular and regular clergy alike, during the fourteenth century, through the epidemic known as the Black Death. To this visitation, the like of which is beyond our comprehension, except vaguely, as happening in India or China, causing, as it did, a mortality of some forty per cent. of a population of less than three millions, must be assigned, not only an irreparable death of properly trained clergy right down to the breach with Rome, but also chiefly, if not wholly, any laxity that may have existed among the smaller monastic communities, whose

numbers, reduced so woefully in ministering to the sick and dying, were never made up again. And moral laxity, be it noted, is, curiously enough, a not uncommon concomitant of widespread plague or disaster, leading, as it so often does, to recklessness and despair. From without and from within, therefore, by the Black Death which killed men's bodies and the leprosy of lax morals which killed their souls, the Church in England had been grievously assailed, even before the last and deadliest assaults of Schism and Heresy, overwhelmed her and her children.

Causes like these must, as I said just now, be taken into account when seeking to assign a reason for a national falling away from the faith. Men do not, as a matter of fact, lightly give up long-cherished beliefs, whether religious or political, the final decision is either forced upon them by a power they are practically incapable of resisting, as first schism, and then heresy, were forced on the English people by Henry and Elizabeth, or is come to as the only possible solution of an intolerable situation, as a choice of the seemingly lesser of two evils. And that Henry deliberately fostered and encouraged a "propaganda of calumny against the Pope, for his own purposes, and of revolt against ecclesiastical authority, there can be no question whatever. It is the merest truism to say that England's separation from the Holy See, in 1534, was the result of fraud no less than of outrageous tyranny. Into the causes that helped to serve Elizabeth's purpose, in 1559 and later, I hope to enter, briefly, in due course.

Another cause which is fairly entitled to rank next in importance to the supremacy of royal authority, tacitly, if not expressly acknowledged, even in spirituals, if only because of its utter unlikeness to any ecclesiastical conditions with which we are familiar, is what may—under correction—be termed the larger measure of autonomy necessarily employed by local bishops at the period in question. Where there was but one Christendom many things were tolerated which a state of warfare with heresy has rendered impossible. The fact, moreover, that good and pious Catholics were to be found in doubt as to whether the Vicar of Christ was, or was not, subject to a General Council, tended, inevitably, to make the submission of primates and metropolitans to the Holy See a matter of theory and profession, rather than of actual practice.

What may, however, be called the physical circumstances of the time are, of course, to be held chiefly responsible for this tacit autonomy of local Churches. When it took weeks, if not months, to convey news to Rome, and to receive a reply, it became necessary that the local ordinary should decide all but the gravest questions on

his own responsibility, with a possible appeal to his metropolitan. Further than this, few, and only the most powerful appellants would be willing even if able to go. The case and the circumstances may, I think, be adequately realized by means of two homely illustrations. As to appeals, how many of us would take a case beyond the Supreme Court to the Privy Council, even with all our modern facilities of travel? Travel, in the age with which we are dealing, meant a **journey on foot**, for the man of moderate means, on horseback for the rich and powerful. You have only to read the story of some ancient pilgrimage to Rome, in order to understand why so few were willing to undertake it. As to the local autonomy of the bishops and metropolitans in all countries north of the Alps, we can only compare it to that possessed by governor-generals in the days before, as one of them expressed it, they were tied to the apron strings of Downing street by an electric wire. All comparisons halt, somewhere, but the illustrations will at least serve our purpose. The main point is, however, that a condition of ecclesiastical government, a localization of authority, a certain inevitable narrowness of spiritual horizon, of national churchliness, with all of which we have long since ceased to be familiar, prevailed at a time when they were most pregnant with danger to the unity of Christendom.

Add to this, as we must, a certain indefiniteness, a certain conflict of jurisdiction between a Church and a State, each of which contained the whole nation and were but aspects of one national life, a tacit recognition of the sovereign as the source and fountain of all honors, even ecclesiastical; a certain unwillingness, on the part of Kings and princes, to admit even the professedly-spiritual claims of one who was both a spiritual and a temporal ruler, claiming an overlordship which was not always, nor wholly, in the latter sphere, only; of one who might be, and often was, a political rival and antagonist; and we arrive at a stage of political-ecclesiastical conditions in which literally, anything, humanly-speaking, may be expected to occur. The wonder, indeed, one may say, with all reverence, is not that so many nations fell away from the unity of Christ's Church, but that so many remained faithful. Nor can these latter, highly favored as they were, boast themselves over their less fortunate fellows. "What hast thou that thou hast not received?"

All this, I would ask the reader to bear carefully in mind, when seeking to account for the lapse of one nation from the Commonwealth of Catholic Christendom. It is, I think, wholly beside the question to insist, as was done by a preacher, not long ago, that England produced no Saints in the century preceding the breach with Rome, such as France produced in the seventeenth. We should

rather count the price she paid, and not in vain, to preserve her ancient glory as the Dowry of Our Lady, the Saints and Martyrs, lay and religious men and women who sealed their loyalty to Peter's See and to Peter's primacy with their blood. It is a true word, also that they were in a very real sense the first martyrs to the sacrament of matrimony.

But we must consider chiefly the condition of that Commonwealth of Catholic Christendom from which Henry's will and tyranny rent England in 1534. It was a Commonwealth, be it noted, hardly recovered at best from the distractions of internecine strife and rivalries; hardly, one may say, assured in its own mind as to the rights, privileges and prerogatives of its traditional and divinely-appointed head. We have, therefore, to take into account, uncertainty as to the respective limits of papal and conciliar jurisdiction; confusion between the spiritual and temporal claims of the Vicar of Christ, and a tendency by no means inexcusable to oppose the former as not infrequently a cloak for the latter; a tendency of which Kings and princes, jealous of their own real or asserted rights, were by no means slow to avail themselves and to resist as the aggression of an enemy that which in itself was the exercise of a lawful, divine authority.

Again the national churchliness just referred to, must be given due place among the causes conducive under given circumstances, to schism, if not to actually heresy; was as likely, that is, to issue in Anglicanism as in Gallicanism. The flock in England, as in all countries north of the Alps, looked, as we have seen, for all ordinary guidance, rather to their local bishops and clergy, than to a distant, not clearly realized personality who, while spiritually Vicar of Christ was very often the active ally of the King's enemies, French, German or Spanish, as the case might be. The inferior clergy and this applies to the religious communities as well, looked naturally to their immediate superiors on whose favor and good will they were to all intents and purposes wholly dependent. These superiors, in their turn, bishops and abbots alike, peers of parliament had equally every human reason for wishing to stand well with a King to whom they owed their advancement, who could and did at his mere will and pleasure deprive themselves of their temporalities and their flocks of their pastoral care; who could and did banish or condemn them to death on an easily-devised and more easily "proved" charge of treason against "this realm of England and the King's Grace." Truly, it is ill arguing with the master of thirty legions of life and death. It is no less true that the King, whether in England, France or Spain, was in all but name supreme head of the Church in his

dominions long before Henry assumed the name of Louis and Philip assigned very effectual if temporary limits to papal jurisdiction in their several Kingdoms.

We have, therefore, a national entity, spiritual and political, that which is practically a national church subject professedly in spirituals, to the Apostolic See and not lacking in a very genuine loyalty thereto, in the sphere of conscience. This national church, however, was one and the same with, being composed of the same individuals, a national state, subject in temporals and so far in conscience to a King who might be and often was lawfully at war with the Vicar of Christ.

This national entity, nowhere so clearly defined and realized, and in no other country of so long duration, as in England, wherein spirituals and temporals, if not identical, must often, to the ordinary man, have seemed indistinguishable; this two-fold unity which appealed alike to men's consciences and to their patriotism; lay in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, at the absolute mercy of the strongest and most self-willed yet possibly at the beginning of his reign at all events the most popular monarch who ever sat on the English throne. The long civil wars which had devastated the country and broken the power of the old feudal nobility, were at an end; the country was prosperous at home and respected abroad. "Bluff King Hal," a typical sixteenth century Englishman, learned and pious, yet not without capacity for brutal cruelty, could do no wrong in the eyes of his subjects, whether nobles, clergy or common people.

And the King's Grace, as wiser and better men have done before and since, set his proud, self-willed heart on that which it was not lawful for him to have. Unused to opposition, he fretted, chafed and finally raged at the obstacles set in his way; obstacles which, to him, must have seemed the result of policy on the pope's part, not of inflexible adherence to his duty as Supreme Shepherd of God's flock. Henry, indeed, would have small difficulty in persuading himself that the pope's reluctance to accede to his wishes was due to fear of offending Spain: "Is not the hand of Joab in this?" We, who see the matter in all its bearings, its motives and its results, know that in the mind of the pope, officially speaking, there could have been no moment's doubt as to the rights of the matter, whatever expediency there might be in postponing a decision fraught with such momentous consequences. Catherine was Henry's wife before God and the Church; death, and death only, could undo the bond. But the mind of the pope, as a temporal sovereign, may have been, and doubtless was, influenced by con-

siderations of policy. He was anxious, in his temporal no less than his spiritual capacity, not to antagonize either England or Spain. The one meant schism, as, indeed, the event was to prove. The other a second Babylonish captivity, the sack of Rome by Spanish troops. And the latter danger was the nearer of the two, the more immediate and the more personal. Had it been otherwise, the pope, as Christ's Vicar, would assuredly have done his duty at all costs. Policy and duty, however, in the Providence of God, were at one. Henry's marriage with Catherine of Arragon was confirmed, and Henry, not unnaturally, as we have said, attributed the decision to policy and fear of Spain. Catherine of Arragon, it will be remembered, was Philip's aunt. We may note, also, that the decision may be taken as the first count in England's indictment of Spain and Spanish influences.

The crisis, therefore, in the history of the English Church, as of the English people, had come. Both lay, as we have seen, at the King's mercy. Henry broke with Rome, and proceeded to make himself head of the spiritual, as he was of the temporal, state of England. The change, if you will think of it, was, but for the name and manner of it, by no means so violent or so startling as it seems to us, to whom its inevitable consequences are clear; even Sir Thomas More, we are told, had for a time doubts as to its possible lawfulness "so far as the law of Christ allows." The King in England—it is well to repeat it—had been, as in all Catholic countries, as he was in France down to the Revolution, the immediate, the real source of honor and advancement, in Church as in State, ever since the Conquest. Theoretically, the pope was Supreme Head of the whole Church; kings, convocations and parliaments had professed as much, in all honesty and sincerity, time and time again. But practically, and so far as the great majority, clergy and laity, could discern, the King's Grace was the head of the Church in his own realm of England, just as the Most Christian King of France and his Catholic Majesty of Spain were in theirs. The question, in any case, since it affected neither belief nor practice, was too abstruse for the ordinary man to decide. Moreover, a decision other than that come to by the King's Grace involved consequences which few cared to face—the rack, the hurdle and the gibbet at the worst; at the lightest, banishment and loss of all that men value most—more, possibly, than their own souls. As to that, they may have reasoned it was a question for theologians to settle; it was for plain men to follow the King's Grace, the nobles and the bishops in these matters, as in all others.

For the nationalism of which we spoke, the practical autonomy,

the sense of oneness in spirituals as in temporals, which characterized the local Church and State, as aspects of the national life in England as elsewhere, and in a very special manner and degree, produced their inevitable effect, once the time was ripe for them, and schism could appeal to the good qualities of Englishmen, their respect for constituted authority, their patriotism, no less than to their national pride and self-will, their too great deference to the great and powerful. Martyrs there were; men and women of all ranks; laity and clergy, Bishops and Abbots, simple priests, monks and nuns; the Lord Chancellor of England himself, doubtful no longer, one and all cheerfully laid down their lives for the rights of Christ's Vicar, the unity of His Church, the sacrament of matrimony. But, though the nation as a whole followed its accustomed leaders into the wilderness of schism, yet the Church of the English people, you must remember, remained, in doctrine as in ritual, to all outward appearance, the same as she had always been. Certain names, as of the "Bishop of Rome" and the "traitor, Thomas Becket," were erased from her service books. Otherwise, so far as plain men could discern, there was no difference between their present state and their past. The King had quarrelled with the Pope? That was his Grace's affair, not theirs; a matter of policy, not of religious belief. If it pleased his Grace to call himself head of the Church within his realm, what concern was it of theirs? It was a new name, and no more, to which they attached no greater significance than to his lately acquired title of Defender of the Faith. He had always been head of the Church except in name. The parish priest sang Mass last Sunday as he did the Sunday before this rumor reached them. His Grace had left their ancient customs as they were. True, there was talk of driving out the monks, who had always been kindly landlords, but doubtless his Grace needed their lands for other uses. So the nation went on its way, unconscious for the most part of its new spiritual condition, content, where conscious, to make the best of things till times should change again; to leave such high matters to its betters, as is the Englishman's way, or was till Radicalism taught him otherwise.

Here we may note, incidentally, the entrance of a new factor, destined in due course to play no small part in making England religiously, and not merely politically, Protestant and anti-Catholic. The Scriptures in the vernacular had, on the authority of Sir Thomas More, been widely used in England with the consent and approval of the ecclesiastical authorities. They were now, however, to be put to a new use, even as they had been by the extreme "reformers" on the Continent, for whom, by the way, Henry had no love, though

willing to use them as instruments in breaking down the lawful authority of his own bishops when it suited his purpose. It was, moreover, in pursuance of this policy of exalting his own ecclesiastical supremacy by all available means that he set about providing his Church and people with a royally authorized version of the Scriptures in English, which go just so far as he chose and no farther. Without going into details, we may say that this policy was the real beginning of religious Protestantism in England, the setting loose of a force which even Henry could not control, which, in its form of the King James Bible, has been the strength and glory of English Protestantism for over three centuries. It is being wounded, as we know, if not annihilated, in the house of its friends; but it must most assuredly be taken into account as influencing very definitely the religious life of the English-speaking races, in forming a type of Protestantism which is characteristically national, but which is no less certainly passing away with the old reverential belief in the divine authority and inspiration of the Book itself.

Coming back, however, to the English Church under Henry VIII, it is of the utmost importance to note that, as I have elsewhere ventured to point out, England's spiritual state, after Henry's breach with the Holy See, was one of schism rather than of formal heresy. But the barrier against heresy, as Henry was not long in discovering, had been removed; and the instruments he had used for his own evil purpose of bringing his bishops into contempt were turned against himself. A church cut off from the divinely appointed centre of truth and unity had no claim to immunity from the assaults of hell. And hell, as we shall find, soon prevailed against it.

Henry, indeed, as head of his own Church, and in defence of his arrogated authority, did his best to keep out the incoming tide of Continental Protestantism which he had been so ready to use when it served his ends. But the men whom he chose to do the work—it cannot be said that he trusted them—played him false even as he had played false to God, to the Vicar of Christ and to his own conscience. Cranmer, whom he had made Archbishop of Canterbury—the words may be taken in their most literal sense—was secretly in sympathy with the foreign extremists, now furious with a king who had first used and then checked them. During Henry's lifetime, however, a wholesome regard for his own safety kept him from openly showing his zeal for the new religion, a zeal which, it may be said, was always, until his final blunder, tempered by a shrewd discretion, and never, except at the last, found incompatible with a skillful trimming of sails to the prevailing wind of royal favor.

But with Henry's death the last barrier to "reform" was re-

moved, and the new Gospel was to work itself out in England as on the Continent. It is in Edward's reign, therefore, that Protestantism as a spiritual force becomes a definite factor in the national life. It is, consequently, at and from this point that the religious enthusiasm of which it was both the cause and the effect must be taken into account. Let our opinion of the leaders in this great revolt against the divinely constituted authority of the Church be what it may, there can be no doubt as to the sincerity of large numbers of their followers. The whole subsequent history of the religious system commonly called Protestantism is, otherwise, inexplicable. How, except on such an admission of the reality and fervor of their faith and enthusiasm, shall we account for the piety, the heroism, the patient endurance of suffering and martyrdom shown by the Camisards of France, the Waldensians of Northern Italy, the Covenanters of Scotland? Men do not die for the sake of a known lie; they cannot. They endure and die for the truth—as they know it. No religion, whether false or true, ever lived, in the sense of shaping men's lives, except in so far as men believed in it and proved their faith by their lives, by their deaths, rather than deny it. Is this a hard saying? I do not doubt that it is. Yet it is of the essence of this question of England's change of faith that we should see facts as they are, not as we conceive they ought to be. Men do not consciously exchange truth for a lie. It is because the old truth has ceased to influence their lives, and the lives of those who should be their leaders, that they seek the new truth, which is, though they know it not, a lie. And if there is any one fact in connection with this period more certain, perhaps, than all others, it is this: that the new religion was to countless thousands a veritable Gospel of God.

It is this fact, I might even say this fact only, which explains the success of Protestantism, namely, that so many accepted it in good faith as the Truth of Christ. Men had, we must remember, to an extent only now again exemplified in France and other Latin countries, lost all faith in the Church, all respect for a clergy so many of whom had never tasted that the Lord is sweet. Belief throughout Christendom had been so long divorced from conduct, in popes, in bishops, in the great and powerful, that men turned in sheer despair to a message which spoke of better things. The new prophets, indeed, prophesied falsely; men, eager to escape the restraints of divine authority, believed readily in a religion which asked faith only, and not works; but it was, nevertheless, in the fervor of its first preaching, a message to "deceive, if it were possible, even the very elect." It was at least a message infinitely better than that of anarchism, socialism and license proclaimed by the

preachers of the devil's latest gospel. Zealots there were among the reformers, self-seekers, evil livers; but the great mass of converts to the new faith were—as they must have been—honest, misguided, simple folks, to whom it was, as I have said, “glad tidings of great joy.” Nor must we forget, in making this admission, that the law governing the life of a religion as a spiritual force is also the law of death, except for God's own; and that if Protestantism is dying, it is because men have ceased to believe in it, have found it to be a lie.

Heresy, as Newman has somewhere said, consists, at first, in over-insistence on some one aspect of truth. In the case of Protestantism, the over-insistence was on the subjective aspect of religion, a protest against the prevailing formalism of the age, wherein objective religion, outward observances, had grown to be of apparently greater importance than the realities signified: “It is iniquity, even the solemn oblation.” The new preachers, by laying undue stress upon the exclusive need of a direct, personal, conscious intercourse between the soul and God, left no room in their scheme of the spiritual life for any efficacy of God's appointed ordinance and sacraments, still less for the priesthood, whom they accused of standing between man and his Maker. This need of personal, intimate relationship between the soul and God was one which saints, mystics and religious founders had preached in all ages, but which the Church had, it seemed, for the most part ignored. But it is in this getting back to the very basis of all soul life, the life hidden in Christ, the Christ-life in the soul; in this similarity, which does really exist between the message of the true and the false reformers, that we trace the beginning of a spiritual kinship between Puritan and monk, between St. Bernard, let us say, and John Bunyan, St. Ignatius of Loyola and Charles Wesley, between St. Francis of Assisi and “General” Booth, which both sides alike have been slow to realize and slower still, in this valley of mists and shadows, at least, to admit Mysticism, it has been well said, is the love of God. A common cause, a common source of soul-life, has inevitably produced a like effect in all who come under its influence, namely, personal, fervent devotion to that Lord in whose life all His true lovers share.

This, again, if I may be forgiven for thus dwelling on it, is something which we must take into account in estimating the causes which led to England's change of spiritual allegiance. The “reformers” in England, as elsewhere, appealed to this need of men's souls no less than to the baser instincts which, after all, do not count for so much as we are sometimes disposed to imagine. It was a need which, in the Ages of Faith, had founded religious orders which

now, unsatisfied with forms, with an orthodoxy apparently powerless to affect the lives and hearts of men, led earnest seekers after holiness—or so I read the matter—into the wilderness of heresy and schism. And, strange as it may seem, many, if spiritual signs and tokens have any real meaning, found there the nourishment which the unfaithful shepherds of the flock had withheld from them; for who shall set limits to the grace and mercy of God? Yet, if this be so, what shall their punishment be, who were, directly or indirectly, responsible for such a scattering of Christ's sheep?

With Edward's reign, then, we first come in contact, so far as England is concerned, with that religious Protestantism commonly known as Continental, which, modified by racial conditions as well as by political exigencies, and imposed by authority rather than democratic, was to leave, under the quasi-churchly forms of the new communion, so profound an impress on the spiritual life of the nation, and to differentiate Anglicanism from all other systems of state Protestantism except, possibly, Swedish Episcopal Lutheranism. We come also upon evidence of that respect for constituted authority which has always hitherto been the Englishman's most marked characteristic; a respect which, given the politico-religious entity of Church and State, that had existed as a twofold expression of the nation's life for over a thousand years, making other ideals simply inconceivable, induced a reverence for law, as expressing the will of the people amounting to an obligation not only of outward, but of conscientious observance. This respect for authority, again, and for its lawful or actual possessors, a respect often misunderstood accounts for the readiness with which the nation as a whole acquiesced in the innovations made by King and Council, by their "betters," to whom—it is well to repeat it—they had always looked for guidance in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. "As for these sheep, what have they done?"

These innovations, moreover, it must be remembered, were made gradually and in matters of doctrine to begin with, rather than of ritual. At most, it was but one more "use" added to or taking the place of the many which had always prevailed in different parts of the country. Where there was open revolt, as in Cornwall, it was probably due to excess of reforming zeal on the part of some local authority, spiritual or temporal; the country as a whole fell in with the new order of things simply because it was an order. England, one may say, was being made Protestant by Act of Parliament, almost without consciousness of the fact. It was, at all events, a fact which did not and could not concern the great mass of a population untrained to think for itself, of serfs, artisans and human

chattels, denied for centuries all semblance of choice or initiative, unpossessed, indeed, of the faculties necessary to either the one or the other. As unfit, that is to say, for self-government, in religion or in politics, as the Russian serfs of half a century ago.

Bearing in mind, then, what we have noted as to the practical autonomy of the local ecclesiastical authorities throughout Catholic Christendom north of the Alps; the interdependence, we might almost say, the identity of Church and State; the very real supremacy of the King, since the Norman conquest, over "all causes and persons, spiritual and temporal," within his dominions, even prior to Henry's open claim to headship over the Church in England, we have, together with English conservatism and respect for constituted authority, all the conditions favorable to Cranmer and Somerset's "reforming" policy. The wonder is, in fact, humanly speaking, of course, not that it was so successful, but that so much that was Catholic rather than Protestant—which the Scottish and Continental zealots plainly condemned as sheer Papistry—was allowed to remain. Comparing the "Reformation" in England, that is to say, with the corresponding movement north of the Tweed, we see how far policy led Cranmer and Somerset to take Luther and Sweden as their models rather than Calvin and Geneva. How far, in other words, they were themselves under those influences of conservatism and respect for authority which made their "reforms" possible and yet what it proved to be; gave it, in fact, both its existence and its form.

With the accession of the ill-used and much-maligned Mary Tudor we note an apparent ebb in the tide of change; a momentary return to ancient and better conditions. We note also that the respect for constituted authority which was so largely responsible for England's lapse into schism and heresy, was equally the cause of its willing return to Catholic unity in that memorable reign. But the mistakes of Mary's policy are no less evident; not so much the persecutions, which, as a recent writer in the "Downside Review" has pointed out, only began after her marriage, but the marriage itself. That, indeed, may justly be termed her one fatal, irremediable error; the cause to which unquestionably may be traced more than any other—I speak advisedly—the subsequent revolt of the English nation against a religion which had become identified with the most justly hated of foreign tyrants, Philip of Spain. Those three words, as I honestly believe, give the answer to our question, What, or who, made England Protestant? Miss Strickland, a Protestant writer, is responsible for the statement that "documents afford incontestable proof that Philip of Spain, not Mary of England, was the reigning

sovereign after their hands were united." (*Lives of the Queens of England*, Vol. III, p. 554.) It is Philip, therefore, and not Mary, who must be held responsible for the persecution of those who professed the new religion, for the "martyrdom" of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, which inevitably won more converts to Protestantism—since men do not die for a known lie—than any other incentive could possibly have done. It made Catholicism hateful in the eyes of Englishmen, not because it was persecution—7,200 persons had been put to death for religion in less than twenty years of Henry's reign—but because it was the outcome of foreign tyranny. Mary, had she remained unmarried, might, had she felt disposed—which there is every reason to believe she did not—have acted in this matter as her father had done and as Elizabeth did afterwards, without loss of popularity. It was the hated Spaniard who set England against her ancient faith.

With the fatal Spanish alliance, therefore, we come a step nearer to the immediate and most active cause of England's apostasy, to the circumstances and conditions which, one may say, made it easy for those in authority to lead the nation astray by an appeal to the instinct of self-preservation. Spain, indeed, as we have seen, was implicated in the English "reformation" from the divorce of Catherine of Arragon to Philip's final attempt to make good his shadowy claim to the crown of England as the sole Catholic representative of the House of Lancaster. This national and very natural enmity must, as I said just now, be, of all other causes, chiefly taken into account; the enmity between Anglo-Norman and Latin, aggravated as it came so be by Philip's avowed intention of reducing England to the condition of a conquered province. Two quotations from an author who, whatever his bias may be held to be, gives his authorities for such historical statements as are here referred to—the late Father Ethelred Taunton—appear to bear this out. As to Philip's real motive he writes: "If there is anything clear in the diplomatic correspondence of the day, now at our disposal, it is that Philip's sole idea in attacking England was his own personal advantage, and that religion was made a cloak for malice." (*Hist. of Jesuits in England*, p. 113.) As to the religious consequences of the attempt, the same author writes, quoting from a paper drawn up by the famous Jesuit, Father Parsons: "The very fact of the Spanish claim being made would greatly aggravate heresy in England . . . on the ground that the enterprise was undertaken for reasons of state, and not for the sake of religion." (*Ibid.*, p. 118.)

Elizabeth, in whose reign England became definitely a Protestant nation, had certainly no cause to love the Catholic religion as

represented by a political pope and by her brother-in-law, Philip of Spain. To both, as it must have appeared to her, she owed the stigma of illegitimacy; her only chance of recognition by the former lay in consenting to marry the latter. This, of course, she had not the slightest intention of doing. Whatever her faults may have been, it is inconceivable that she should have been guilty of so grave a folly, fatal, as she knew it must be, not only to her own popularity, but to the welfare of the country itself.

For that she was popular with the vast majority of her people, with Catholics no less than with the reform party, there can be no question whatever, as England's answer to the Armada, the ships under the Catholic Lord Howard of Effingham, showed to all the world. It is a fact which we must recognize and admit to the fullest possible extent if we would understand and account for the success of her religious policy. We must regard her, that is, as she was in fact, namely, as perhaps the greatest woman sovereign who ever sat on any throne; greater, certainly, than any of her contemporaries; more than a match, as she proved, for the cunning, Machiavellian world-master Philip of Spain. Great servants she doubtless had, such as Cecil and Walsingham, but her greatness lay in her ability to use them to the greatest political and temporal welfare of her country. And it is the fact of this popularity which bears out what was said just now concerning the endurance by her people of her masterful, relentless methods, of her pitiless persecution not less of her ultra-Protestant than of her "Papist" subjects. She was, in a word, the idol of Englishmen, queen by the best of all rights, the free, willing consent of those over whom she ruled. This, I know, will appear a bold statement for a Catholic to make, but if it is not an accurate presentment of facts, on what other theory can we account for the failure of every attempt to wrest the throne from her? Even barring Philip as hopelessly impossible, Mary of Scotland was Elizabeth's own cousin, with an immeasurably better claim to the crown, and a Catholic. That very circumstance shows how far, in less than fifty years, England had drifted from her old attitude towards the Holy See. It was Mary's Catholicism more than anything else that made her unacceptable to a nation, forty per cent. of whom were still Catholics.

Personally, Elizabeth was indifferent to religion, but if she had no love for Catholicism, which set bounds to her authority, she had even less for the extreme Continental type of Protestantism, which set all authority except that of conscience wholly at naught, and aimed at a theocracy more arbitrary than that of which any pope could be accused. The party of "reform"—a noisy minority at her

accession—was, however, in the ascendancy, thanks to national hatred of Spanish tyranny. While, therefore, her own leanings would probably have been towards a “national Catholicism” such as had prevailed in the latter years of her father’s reign, **circumstances, as she clearly saw, together with the refusal of the Marian bishops to acknowledge even a qualified Royal Supremacy, made it inevitable that she should revert, instead, to the religious settlement of her brother, as embodied in the second prayer-book of 1552.** The Pope’s refusal to recognize her as lawful Queen of England except on what may be called Philip’s matrimonial terms, and the latter’s personal enmity, once she had refused to marry him, tended to confirm her in the policy she had chosen. The Catholic powers, following the lead of Spain, were against her; not even by a French marriage, almost, if not quite, as unpopular as a Spanish one, could she hope to ensure the tranquil possession of her throne and the welfare of her country. There remained only the Protestant princes of Germany, the growing power of the Low Countries, and the Huguenots of France, any or all of whom she could play off against her Catholic rivals. One more, therefore, it was Philip of Spain who settled England’s religious policy. His personal enmity made Elizabeth’s choice inevitable. And, the Queen’s choice once made, she pursued her course to the only end possible under the circumstances—the creation, namely, of a new politico-religious entity which should embrace Church and State as completely and as exclusively as they had been united from St. Augustine to Cardinal Pole, but which should be subject in spirituals not to “the Bishop of Rome,” but to herself and to her successors. It was the policy which began, continued and accomplished the separation of England from the unity of Catholic Christendom. Yet it was, as I have elsewhere endeavored to show, a policy which bore within itself the seeds of its own undoing, if, and when, in God’s time and God’s way, those seeds shall ripen and bear fruit a hundredfold.

To the question, therefore, as to how England became Protestant, what has been here said, while in no sense an answer, may at least serve as some sort of explanation. The causes, in the Providence of God, were the general state of Christendom, the appeal to the national character at its best and at its worst; but the person chiefly responsible was Philip of Spain. So, at all events, I read the history of the most momentous and most curious phase of the movement commonly known as the Protestant Reformation.

FRANCIS W. GREY.

A TYPICAL JESUIT.

A TYPICAL Jesuit! What a different impression these words convey to different minds! To the ultra-Protestant or bigotedly non-Catholic mind they suggest a type which malignity and prejudice have long made familiar to the world: the incarnation of craft and subtlety of dissimulation brought to the perfection of a fine art, of a Protean personality veiling under various disguises a character wily and insinuating, what the French call *très fin*; with a passion for tortuous intrigue, pursuing by dubious methods a fixed policy which aims at nothing less than an *imperium in imperio* in the ecclesiastical domain and a dominant influence in the State and in the family; not over-scrupulous as to the methods to be employed in attaining that object, holding that the end justifies the means. This is the Jesuit of fiction. His pen-portrait has been drawn by many literary polemicists and romancists from Pascal and Molière to Eugene Sue, plagiarized and paraphrased by obscure scribblers in a subsidized and suborned literature which reproduces the type satirized in the *Lettres Provinciales*, *Tartufe* and *Le Juif errant* without the talent that has secured notoriety for those classic libels. The head of the Society he represents has been called "the Black Pope," and the Society itself "the Black International": a secret society with world-wide ramifications, a kind of moral octopus grasping every rank and class in its tenacious tentacles; a nightmare disturbing the dreams of statesmen and stifling human liberty under its oppressive weight. It is a spectre more fearful than that of the Brocken, haunting the imaginations of those old ladies of both sexes who frequent May meetings at Exeter Hall and suffer more or less acutely from that mental malady diagnosed by Joseph de Maistre as "Papaphobia," of which it is a phase that may be designated "Jesuit-on-the-brain." Certain authors and publishers find it profitable to pander to this prejudice, this hallucination. Protestantism of the old-fashioned school or anti-Catholicism of the Continental type have made the market for these kind of literary wares; and in a commercial age like ours, the supply is proportioned to the demand.

Look at that picture, and then on this. Contrast the Jesuit in fiction with the Jesuit in fact; the counterfeit presentment with the living reality; the impalpable creation of morbid imaginations, wrought upon by romance-writers and no-Popery lecturers, with the actual personality daily encountered in various walks of life: the model town missionary, ministering to high and low, to rich and poor in crowded cities; the foreign missionary traversing and toiling

in untrodden wilds, in the Church's uttermost borderlands or outposts; the intrepid pioneer of civilization among savage races; the zealous apostle shedding the light of Faith on continents and islands darkened by idolatry; the skilled educationist; the keen-witted scientist, reaping, in a rich harvest of knowledge, the long results of time; the daring explorer; the voluminous writer who has increased the wealth of philosophical and theological learning, the common property of the whole Catholic world, and the gifted *litterateur* who has made the printing press, the chief offensive weapon employed by the Reformation, one of the most powerful and effective weapons of the Church's intellectual armory for the defence and propagation of Catholic Truth.

A good specimen of the type-Jesuit of real life, as known to and esteemed by men who live and breathe in a wholesome atmosphere unclouded and untainted by passion or prejudice, was the late Father Schomberg Kerr, whose active, well-filled and exemplary life as a sailor and a Jesuit has been interestingly narrated by his cousin, the Hon. Mrs. Maxwell-Scott, of Abbotsford.¹ The special characteristic of that life was devotion to duty. Prompt obedience to the word of command, which he unfailingly practiced as a naval officer, was the dominant note of his character and conduct as a Jesuit priest. That naturalness, unaffectedness, total absence of "side," that *bonhomie* which pleasingly characterize the English naval officer were equally observable in the priest. Without any tendency to rigorism or any pretence of pietism, as a layman and as a priest, wherever he went he left behind him the impression of a man of well-balanced mind and character, of courage and constancy and wholesouled devotion to duty. He was essentially a manly man, whose manliness was based upon and sustained by solid virtue.

Henry Schomberg Kerr, R. N., S. J., second son of Lord Henry Kerr—son of the sixth Marquis of Lothian and of Louisa Dorothea, daughter of General the Hon. Sir Alexander Hope, son of John, second Earl of Hopetown—was born on August 15, 1838, at the Rectory, Dittisham, Devonshire, and baptized on September 24 by Lord Henry, then rector of the parish, a living presented to him by his cousin, Lord Mount Edgcumbe, and which was his home from 1830 till he resigned in 1851. A partiality for "a life on the ocean wave" was hereditary. His father, when a boy, wanted to be a sailor, but, in compliance with paternal wishes, lived the humdrum life of a country parson in place of the breezy, bustling life he would

¹ Henry Schomberg Kerr, Sailor and Jesuit. By Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott of Abbotsford. Longmans, Green & Co., 1891.

have preferred. They were good Christians according to their lights. The mother, although always more or less an invalid, devoted her unfailing energy and charity to aiding her poor and sick neighbors. She was the doctor for all the illnesses in the parish, and as soon as her children could walk she would send them to carry medicines and food to the sick poor, insist on their looking at the wounds, withered limbs or deformities of the suffering people, and taught them to make themselves useful in the cottages they visited. She trained them also to charity by encouraging them to set aside a portion of their meals in order to have more to take to the sick, and to choose Fridays and vigils for this mortification.² With such dispositions as these, it is not surprising to find that the Rome-ward movement, initiated by Tractarianism, captivated and captured them. While Schomberg was spending his last two years of school life at Winchester, his father, relates Mrs. Maxwell-Scott,³ was passing through the crisis of his religious life. Although by no means so high a Churchman as Newman, Pusey, Hurrell Froude and others, Lord Henry was deeply interested in their writings and opinions, and gradually adopted many of the changes brought about by them in the Anglican ceremonial. Cardinal Newman's conversion was at first a great shock to him, for as yet he felt little attraction to the Catholic Church, although he was unconsciously advancing towards the truth, aided, no doubt, by his unselfish work for the souls under his charge, and his own sincere and earnest endeavor to do God's will in all things. The Gorham judgment in 1849 was to him and his brother-in-law, Mr. James Hope, the event which finally shook his confidence in the Church of England; and from that moment he began to entertain thoughts of resigning his living and becoming a Catholic. He left Dittisham in 1851, spending the next few months in study and prayer for guidance. At length he was received into the Church at Clifton on August 24, 1852, and his reception was followed shortly by that of Lady Henry and five of his children. Schomberg was just going to sea when his father took this great step, a step he himself did not take until May, 1855.

Schomberg joined the navy on the eve of stirring times, when England was about making history. It was still the epoch of the old "wooden walls" which contributed so much to its naval supremacy, and long before "Dreadnoughts" were dreamed of or anticipations of German competition on the seas, then ruled by Britannia, entered into the calculations of British statesmen. It was the last of what he calls the poetic days of masts and sails and volunteer crews.

² *Life of Madame Henrietta Kerr.*

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.

When, as naval cadet, he joined, in 1852, his first ship, H. M. S. *Vengeance*, the Mediterranean Squadron was in the zenith of its power and prestige. George Tryon, destined later to win renown as Admiral Sir George Tryon, was then a midshipman on board the same ship, of which Sir William Robert Mends, whom he describes as "one of the smartest officers that ever graced the quarter deck," was commander. As a school of discipline the navy was an excellent preparation for the life he was destined to lead. But it was a hard school and meant roughing it. To be brought before the Captain on Thursday mornings, he says, was a terrible thing, resulting generally in "four dozen" or a "week's cells"—the time being spent "one or both legs in irons." What with mastheading, leave-stopping and extra watch on deck, and frequent cobblings in the gun room below, the middies were kept well in order, and lost more of their angles, but not their spirit. Writing in 1895 of this early phase of his life, he says: "On going to sea I had often heard my father and my elders say, 'It all depends on his first ship,' little knowing what it meant. But now, after the lapse of forty years and more, I can say that, as an officer and seaman, those few months with Mends had the greatest effect on me, and, indeed, shaped my career. He formed us to love order and active habits, and besides gave us a taste for our profession."

The Russian war was brewing in the East, and next year the combined squadrons anchored in two long lines of battle in Besika Bay. When in Beikos Bay it fell to his lot as midshipman of the jolly-boat to turn out each morning at 3.30 o'clock and take the stewards across to Therapia, where the ambassadors dwelt, upon which he remarks: "It was a cold job, especially when the north wind made a funnel of the Upper Bosphorus; but it was better than washing decks, with lanterns and bare feet, on a frosty morning." After war was declared and the invasion of the Crimea decided on, they all put to sea, numbering about 800 vessels, perhaps the largest Armada, tonnage as well as numbers considered, that the world had ever seen. On the memorable 20th of September, 1854, the fleet, anchored off the Alma, watched the battle; but the volumes of smoke—smokeless powder being yet unknown—and the broken ground marred the view. The October 17 operations by sea and land commenced, and there was a general bombardment of Sebastopol, in which all the ships took part. On November 5 they got glimpses of Inkerman from the Katcha, but could not follow the battle. Of Sir Lewis Tobias Jones, captain of the *Sampson*, one of the vessels engaged, he says: "I have reason to be grateful to this brave old salt, for, on the passage out, he put me into a canvas rig, dipped my hands

into the tar bucket, and sent me aloft." Admiral Pollard, a brother officer, writes of Schomberg: "We served together from 1852 to the end of 1854, on the *Vengeance*. It was then our lifelong friendship was formed. He was about four years younger, and so I had it in my power to help him in various ways. His straightforward and courteous disposition made him a general favorite, and to myself he was most loving and kind. I remember well at the attack of the allied fleets on Sebastopol my dear friend two or three times came to my quarters to see if I was all right. He was full of courage and perfectly calm."

When he returned, in May, 1855, a pleasant surprise awaited his family in their Scotch home, Huntlyburn, near Melrose. As early as February, 1853, he had felt drawn towards Catholicism, but his return to his ship gave him, at that time, no opportunity for serious study. During his two years' absence he had evidently thought out the subject until conviction was reached, for he came back with the intention of becoming a Catholic. But he kept his mind to himself, and his reception came upon the family as a joyful surprise. On Wednesday, May 21, they were astonished to meet him returning from early Mass at Galashiels when they were driving thither for the High Mass. Very early next morning he was received into the Catholic Church at Galashiels by Father Egan, the priest in charge of the mission, whom he had visited several times for instruction. On his return he said, "I am now as much a Catholic as any of you." Lady Henry wept for joy, and the whole household repaired to the domestic chapel to thank God for the great grace bestowed upon Schomberg, who made his first Communion there on May 29, and was confirmed by Bishop Brant at St. George's Cathedral, Southwark, on June 5, before rejoining his new ship, *H. M. S Sphinx*, which proceeded to the Crimea. In the spring of 1856 Lord and Lady Henry Kerr, having gone abroad for some months, accompanied by their eldest son, William, before the latter entered on his career in the Indian Civil Service, met the neophyte at Venice by what his mother called "a special Providence," which she piously attributed to her *Aves*. Just as he was ready to start from Scutari, the smallpox broke out in his ship and necessarily cancelled his leave; but, by apparent accident, he unexpectedly turned up while they were at Venice. A young brother officer narrates an incident which occurred about this time at Portsmouth, where they spent a fortnight aboard the *Victory*, and which brings out a characteristic trait. "When going to Mass on Sunday with Schomberg," he says, "he asked me what I intended giving at the offertory. I said sixpence, and that I generally gave that amount.

'Be generous,' he said, 'give a shilling, give a shilling,' in his charming coaxing way. I did give a shilling, and his remark at that time, I have always felt, has colored my offerings ever since."

For over two years he next served on H. M. S. *Indus*, flagship on the North American Station, under its commander, Vice-Admiral Houston Stewart, first as midshipman and then as acting mate and mate. He had already, by his attention to duty and the manliness and earnestness of his character, won the entire trust of his superiors, and at Halifax was permitted to take not only the Catholics of his own ship to Mass on Sundays, but those of the other men-of-war that might be in harbor, having leave, as a special privilege, to march them up to the cathedral, a mile and a half from the dock-yard, instead of going to the chapel. This involved proceeding through the principal streets of the town, when the sight of the men and their youthful leader created much interest. He maintained strict discipline, and never lost a man from the ranks.

During his absence his parents, accompanied by his sister Henrietta, went to Hyères, where he rejoined them on his return to England in February, 1859. A lady, recalling those days, relates the impression he made on her. "My reminiscences of him," she writes, "are centred in his admirable practical love of duty. There was a serious earnestness in everything he did. I remember during that first winter or early spring at Hyères, where he spent a few weeks on leave, the fervor of his growing faith, for he had not long been received into the Church. At the evening Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament he would walk up that dear old church of St. Louis and kneel during the service at the altar rails, unconscious of doing anything unusual." It was at this time he paid his first visit to the shrine of Notre Dame de la garde, at Marseilles, to which he ever after had a special devotion.

In April he joined H. M. S. *Exmouth* for a short time, and went out to Malta, and in August was appointed to H. M. S. *Cyclops*, then cruising in Suez Roads. Schomberg, now Lieutenant Kerr, spent the next two years in the East. After his return to England in 1861, he spent some time with the Hope Scotts⁴ at Dorlin, their beautiful property on Loch Shiel in Scotland. "In spite of the pleasant family gatherings and visits," writes Mrs. Maxwell-Scott,⁵ "these months must have had a certain sadness for Schomberg, as they were the last that he and Henrietta were to spend together at home. As

⁴ Early that year Mr. Hope Scott had married Lady Victoria Fitzalan Howard, eldest daughter of Henry Granville, Duke of Norfolk, and sister of the present Duke.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

early as 1856 Henrietta had spoken to him of her dawning wish to live only for God, and in her childish way she had mapped out a plan of life both for herself and Schomberg." "The first time she ever heard of hermits," records his sister's biographer,⁶ "she determined to lead a life like his, and this hermitage, which, by the way, was to be shared by this same brother, became a kind of dream to her as the ideal of happiness. They were to take a farmhouse by the sea, very far north, and live there together, doing all the work themselves, and hardly ever speaking, 'serving God like the ancient hermits.'"

Brother and sister united also in longing to be martyrs, and mutually agreed to pray for this grace. "In reading such things," observes Mrs. Maxwell-Scott, "it is difficult to avoid thinking of St. Teresa and her brother, and their youthful desires of serving God; and if Henrietta's ideal was to change somewhat, she, like St. Teresa, in the end obtained the wish of her heart, a grace shared by Schomberg later on. In these last home-days the brother and sister probably often talked together of Henrietta's growing vocation, and as, even earlier than this, Schomberg himself seems to have had some idea that his own path in life was not finally fixed, he would no doubt speak of this to her."⁷ He was at Barbadoes, on board H. M. S. *Phaeton*, when his sister entered the novitiate of the Sacred Heart Order at Conflans, near Paris, on September 8, 1863; whereupon he wrote to his mother: "You can fancy with what interest I looked forward to receiving your last, and though, as I expected, you had not time to say much, yet enough to show me how all had been blessed, and how happy Hënrietta must be, now she has realized wishes that have been uppermost in her heart for years. The idea carries me back to the time when she and I first talked of it, which, I think, must have been about November, 1856, though I have no distinct remembrance till early in 1859, when we were at Hyères, and then even I thought it would prove more a dream in 1863 (like my case) than an accomplished fact. I must say I did not bargain to see her no more in the world when I left in 1861; but better as it is; God and Our Lady are sooner pleased, and Henrietta herself is happier, and will pray for us all the more, and for what is right for me, so *Deo gratias*."

The concluding words give us the first glimpse or foreshadowing of his own still latent vocation. His cousin, in endeavoring to give an idea of his character and characteristics at this time, says:

⁶ Life of Madame H. Kerr, p. 35.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 44, 45.

"In features and natural temperament he perhaps most nearly resembled his mother and his sister Henrietta, and the boy of the 'bright eye and open countenance' had now become a man of noble appearance, with a singular charm of manner. Unfortunately for us, Schomberg's portraits—especially the later ones—give only the rather stern and even sad expression which characterize his features in repose, the result, probably, of his early initiation into the graver experiences of life, and of his own earnest, resolute soul; but all who knew him will recall the way in which his face would light up in conversation, his beautiful and winning smile; while his intimates were well aware of the affectionate, sensitive nature that lay beneath the habitually calm and grave exterior. They recognized and loved what one of his old friends calls his 'rare sunny nature,' with his 'warm-hearted love for his family and friends.' We have seen how thoroughly Schomberg devoted himself to the duties of his profession, and we have had glimpses of his zeal for all the practices of his faith and of his care for the souls of others manifested in a mature degree unusual for one so young. In fidelity to his spiritual duties, he thus set an excellent example to all the Catholic members of the crew, and took care that those under his charge should have the fullest opportunity of practicing their religion. Some notes of a very intimate nature, and which show his spirit of prayer and self-denial, remain to us. They are jotted down in pencil in a little French book of devotions, and although it is now impossible to give the exact date at which they were written, the resolutions which they record probably formed a part of Schomberg's daily life for years. The notes are as follows:

"Rosary (to say) five sorrowful mysteries every first and middle watch.

"Meditation, on the sufferings of our Lord, daily.

"Wine, abstain from on Wednesdays and Fridays; value of allowance, 2 s., to be given in charity.

"Second course, abstain from.

"Entrées, do., on Wednesday and Friday.

"Fish—Eat fish, when able, in preference to meat.

"Meat—Not to eat meat oftener than twice in a day.

"Fish and Meat—Never at the same meal.

"Milk and Sugar—Abstain from milk and sugar on Wednesday, Friday and Saturday."

These little revelations of Schomberg's inner life help us to understand his constant aspirations after a higher state, as well as his devotion to his daily duties—God's present will for him—and his unselfish spirit, which was, among other things, often shown by his

taking the duties of his brother officers, thus freeing them for more congenial occupations. "Oh, Kerr will do it!" was an expression often heard when the question arose of a party of sport or pleasure which might come in contact with certain duties on board—"and so he did."⁸

Admiral Ernest Rice, who had been his fellow-lieutenant for nearly three years on H. M. S. *Duncan*, the flagship of a near relative of Kerr's,⁹ Admiral Sir James Hope, K. C. B., in command of the North American and West Indian Station, writes of the time they spent together in Nova Scotia: "We often shared the same room, and I remember how much I admired his simple and unostentatious goodness; he always knelt at his bedside at night, however long and tiring a day we had had. On one occasion, when I said I was too tired to say my prayers, he replied, 'God knows that as well as you, and does not want long prayers; kneel down and thank Him for all His blessings.' In these days, when the exercise of a man's religious duties is provided for and protected by those in authority, this may not seem anything worthy of remark, but thirty years ago a young man who had determined, as Schomberg Kerr had, never to be ashamed of confessing his faith and hope in Christ Jesus, publicly and privately, had often to undergo much covert ridicule and many hard sayings. The last time we met was in 1888, at Southsea, where he had come to see on his way to Bournemouth. In the course of conversation I said, by way of a joke, 'They ought to have made you a bishop by this time, Schomberg.' He answered, to my astonishment, 'They did offer me Bombay, but I preferred missionary work.'¹⁰ And so he went on to his glorious and happy end. I say happy, because he bore it in his face. When he left the room my wife said, 'I never saw perfect peace and goodness so plainly on any man's countenance.'"

During the summer of 1866 he took an active part in the successful completion of the laying of the first Atlantic cable—

Linking two worlds by a chain that sages
Forged in the heat of a science dream,"

—having been given command of H. M. S. *Lily*, the ship Sir James Hope had been instructed by the British Admiralty to place at the service of the expedition, and was one of the first to send a tele-

⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 50-52.

⁹ Sir James Hope, born 1808, died 1881, was son of Sir George Hope, and by his mother, Lady Jemima, grandson of James, third Earl of Hopetoun, and thus second cousin to Lady Henry Kerr.

¹⁰ He was then a Jesuit.

graphic message by the cable, addressed to his parents at Huntlyburn. He was then senior naval officer of the Newfoundland Division, and accompanied the *Great Eastern* down Trinity Bay when it proceeded to recover the lost cable of the previous year.

It was during the stormy homeward voyage of the *Lily* in the autumn of 1866, it is surmised, that he finally resolved to become a priest, believing that Our Lady had heard his prayer and promise on that occasion. "Possibly also," Mrs. Maxwell-Scott comments, "the statue of Notre Dame de la Garde, which Schomberg sent to the church at Halifax, was a thank-offering for the safety of the ship." This seems probable from Schomberg's special reference to Our Lady under that title in his letter, and from his making in the following spring a pilgrimage to the shrine at Marseilles, for which he had a peculiar affection." In a letter to his father, written on board the *Lily*, he said: "There have been moments on the passage when, was it not for my faith in Notre Dame de la Garde, I doubted the little ship surviving to reach the old country."

During his sojourn at home after this, his old desires and aspirations, his cousin notes, were maturing and taking shape, and that in spite of his early and well-earned promotion, and of the promising future it opened to him, in spite still more of his affectionate attachment to family and friends, he was very seriously occupied with the thought of that higher life and sacrifice of himself to Almighty God, to which he was beginning to feel he was actually called. On his way to Rome in 1867, in company with the Duke of Norfolk, he visited the shrine of Notre Dame de la Garde in thanksgiving for his safe voyage back from Newfoundland. On April 13, the travellers had an audience of Pius IX, who gave a special blessing to his sister Henrietta's crucifix¹¹—she was then at the convent of the Trinità di Monti—and on the 17th they were present at the Pope's Mass and received Holy Communion. He frequently consulted her on the subject which then absorbed his thoughts—his future life and the disposal of it. "It was indeed," writes his biographer, "a time of great mental anxiety for Schomberg. On one side he could not but be conscious that he had not only won success in his profession, but that it afforded him many opportunities of working for God and for the welfare of others; while on the other hand his wish to give up the world and devote himself wholly to God's service in the priesthood was becoming stronger. It seems clear, also, that he had already felt drawn to the Society of Jesus."

By an appropriate coincidence his sojourn in Rome synchro-

¹¹ This crucifix, her constant companion in life and on her death bed, she bequeathed to her brother, who used it till his own death in 1895.

nized with that of a clever young Catholic lawyer from Halifax, Mr. Kenny, who had been educated at Stonyhurst, who had had personal experience of Kerr's work amongst the Catholic sailors on the Newfoundland Station, when he saw him act like a most zealous missionary, keeping a list of all the Catholic sailors, looking after their wants spiritual and temporal, leading them to Mass and the sacraments, and taking care of them generally. Both were then meditating becoming, what they afterwards became, Jesuit priests. "It frequently happened," writes one of the Fathers of the Society, then in Rome, "that Mr. Kenny and Mr. Kerr called on me the same day. Kenny asked me, 'What is bringing Kerr here so often? Every time I come to see you I meet him coming or going away.' Oddly enough Kerr had just asked the same question in the same words about Kenny. At the time, neither of them had ever spoken directly of the question of vocation, but both seemed much interested in the details of our life at the Roman College, and in the life of the Jesuit generally. Kerr especially was particular in his questions about two English naval officers, Captain Wood and Lieutenant Augustus Law, who had become Jesuits. I had lived at St. Acheul with Mr. Law, and was able, therefore, to answer for him and for his enthusiastic love of the Jesuit life—the only enduring alternative to which, as he often declared, was the life in the British navy; the same obedience, the same manly contempt of bodily comforts, the same indifference to place or surroundings, being found in both. In fact, to the end of his days a martyr to missionary zeal in South Africa (where Father Kerr himself also gave his life), Father Law bore the stamp of the sailor as clearly as that of the priest. It was only at my last meeting with Father Kerr in Rome that it flashed across my mind that he was in doubt about his vocation. I remember it as if it were yesterday. I was going to pay a visit at the convent of Trinità di Monti, and just outside the door I met Schomberg. He seemed much agitated, rushed over to me and said: 'Oh, Father Delaney, I have bad, bad news! I have just been summoned to go back to my ship.' I had heard that he had been appointed commander of the *Bellerophon*, and I replied, 'Well, I was just on the point of congratulating you, but you seem to think it not a matter for congratulation.' 'No,' said he, 'it disarranges all my plans. I had counted on six months leave at least' (I am not sure if he did not say a year), 'and I wanted it all to look about me. You must pray and say Masses for me that God may guide me to do what is best.'" He did what was best when, six weeks after joining, he left the *Bellerophon* and the service, and, at the close of a retreat at Dalkeith, having consulted two Jesuits, Fathers Amherst and Whitty, he joined the Society of

Jesus on the feast of the Sacred Heart. Father Kenny, when he heard of it, called to mind that, when in Rome, Schomberg used to visit the shrine of Mater Admirabilis, Our Lady of the Lily, at the Sacred Heart Convent of the Trinità, and fancied Our Lady under that invocation might have had much to do with his happy decision. He himself made no mystery about the genesis and development of his vocation. In some notes jotted down relating to his retreat he says: "In 1859 I made a sort of promise with my sister that we would both serve God in religious life. I have never forgotten it. She never wavered, and has been in the convent of the Sacred Heart four years already, and has since been praying daily for me. I cannot allow her to beat me in heroism for God. I believe if any of my messmates in the last five years' cruise were told that I had become a priest they would say, 'I always thought so,' or at any rate would not be at all surprised. And I write this with all humility."

What most attracted him to the Society of Jesus was its refusal of all ecclesiastical dignities, and the hatred borne to it by the world. His parents acted as Catholic parents should act on such momentous occasions. "Lord and Lady Henry," records Mrs. Maxwell-Scott, "with all the generosity of their fervent faith and unselfishness, gave their full consent to his wishes." His sister in a charming congratulatory letter wrote: "What can I say to you? I am too happy either to write or think. This morning we were renewing our vows at Mass at 5.30 (which we generally do on the Feast of the Sacred Heart, but which was deferred this year on account of the bustle and crowd), and my chief thought was, 'How happy I should be if old Schommy were one day to be doing as I was.' I could scarcely think of anything else. I fancy our Lord must have smiled to see my anxiety, knowing as He did that in the course of the day I should get your letter. How I do thank Him, and that good Mater Admirabilis! . . . Our Lord, now your sole Master as He is mine, will crown His other graces by the greatest of all—perseverance. How thankful I am to think that every instant of your life is going to be employed in His service!" A supernatural as well as natural affection seems to have united these two souls. The good nun's letters, into which she put her whole soul, reveal her as a woman of well-balanced mind and character, of sound sense, clear-headedness and spiritual insight, who constituted herself a kind of ancillary spiritual director to her brother. To his cousin and future biographer he wrote: "On the Feast of the Sacred Heart (June 28, 1867) I offered my life to God in the Society of Jesus, through the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, and on the 8th of September I enter the novitiate. This may or may not astonish you, and you may be sorry or glad;

but in any case I know you will thank God with me and so share my happiness. I have had the idea for many years." When, a little later, his brother entered religion, his mother wrote: "Our two eldest sons, William and Schomberg, the sailor, were both called by God last year, and both entered the Jesuit novitiate; he on September 8, William on St. Stanislaus Day, November 13, and so both have now half proved their wonderful vocations." The novice-master of Roehampton, Father Fitzsimon, when he heard that his name was Schomberg, remarked, "Why, there is no saint of that name." "Then it is your business to make one," Schomberg promptly replied. If there is such a thing as a short and direct road to sanctity, St. Ignatius discovered it in that absolute obedience, that perfect self-surrender and complete detachment which he exacted from his subjects, which extinguishes exaggerated self-assertiveness and individualism and is a wholesome antidote to what the French call *la maladie de moi*. He was already half-formed in the spirit of the Rule when, as a probationer, he went through the Spiritual Exercises; "ready," as he declared "to go where duty calls," and with a "fixed determination to strive to the end in the high avocation to which God had been pleased to call him." He underwent successfully the six experiments or special tests through which every Jesuit candidate must pass in his two years' novitiate, at least such as are practicable in England. He retained and applies to his new sphere of action not only the sense of duty so strictly inculcated in the British navy, but the seafaring phraseology so familiar to him and upon which he frequently drew to supplement the official Latin to which he was not so accustomed. Indeed, his biographer observes, he never either could or would unlearn the language of the sea, and to the end of his life what landsmen call "upset" was for him "capsize," a bout of temperature was "dirty weather," and although it might "blow heavy guns" he was resolved to "stick to the ship" to the last. Their "navy brother" was a universal favorite among his fellow-novices, although their previous lives had been very dissimilar. "They," comments Mrs. Maxwell-Scott,¹² "had given up no career, for they never entered one; they had not drunk deeply of the cup of worldly pleasure; and they had been mercifully shielded from the world's most fatal lures; they were, after all, hardly more than schoolboys. But here was a man in the prime of life, who had thrown up an honorable profession in which he had already distinguished himself, and left it just at the moment when a brilliant prospect opened upon him. With a full realization of what the sacrifice involved, he had ex-

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 103.

changed liberty for restraint, fame for obscurity, a position of authority for one of unquestioning submission." He used to speak of the navy as an excellent training for religious life, although he never tried to underrate its dangers for weak characters; it taught men, he said, obedience, and the endurance of hardship, and resource in difficulties and courage and loyal to superiors. The highest praise a captain can give one of his crew is to describe him as a "smart" man. Kerr's ideal of a Jesuit was that he should be a "smart" man, and he lived up to it. In a letter to his old friend, Colonel Colthurst, he describes himself as "happier and jollier than ever having "at last found the life he had been hunting after for many years." In a letter to his mother he says: "I am a bad hand at writing, but I could write volumes on God's mercies to me—If I was to trace them right through till they culminate in vocation to the Society of Jesus. Much as you think you know of Jesuits, your knowledge of their interior life is yet small. What virtues &c., these good fathers practise, who, to the exterior eye, calmly come and go to Huntlyburn almost unnoticed, is perhaps only known to God, and partially to a chosen few, and will be rewarded with crowns exceeding great hereafter." The Jesuits did not impress outsiders so favorably as he soon realized. He and some other scholastics happened one day to be strolling by a band of natives at work on the drains or pipes at Wimbledon. As the meek-looking scholastics passed, one of the workers said to his fellow: "Who be them chaps, Bill?" "Them," said his companion, "them's the chaps they make the parsons of." "Lor," said the other, "what duffers!" Naturally, sensitive to appearance and the opinion of others, he felt very keenly this depreciatory criticism, but he suppressed himself, his desire for humiliation being insatiable. Father Conmee, his fellow student in the Juniorate, who relates this and other incidents that bring into relief his patient characteristics, concludes his fragmentary recollections with the remark: "I think of him always as one thinks of the saints. I think of his humility, his exact observance, his patience, his mortification, and behind it all the sacrifice he made in all he gave up for God. Not that anything of this latter ever escaped him. On the contrary, he counted it as the most singular of favors to have been allowed to enter the Society of Jesus. Often have I heard him on this theme, and often have I noticed his glowing admiration for St. Ignatius, whose career in some points he was privileged to imitate. But, after all, my highest and holiest memories of him are those that show him to me before the tabernacle, praying to that Master whom, as all who ever knew him, will testify, he so deeply and so tenderly loved. How well can I recall

the Holy Thursday night of 1870, when he petitioned to be let spend the night watching before the altar of repose. Those that came and went throughout the night found him motionless there, the faithful, silent servant of the Lord." His invariable rule was to do everything "with his whole heart." Writing in October, 1874, from St. Beuno's, where he and his brother William studied theology; he says: "Now that I have entered the last year of my preparation, the dignity of the priesthood and the grandeur of that wondrous act of religion reveal themselves more clearly." His anxiety to make up for what he called the deficiencies of his early education, which induced him to put off his ordination for a year, led to the two brothers being ordained together on Sunday, September 19, 1875, the feast of the Seven Dolours of Our Lady, forming a portion of a group of twenty-five ordinati, the largest number of priests ordained at one time in Great Britain since the Reformation. They celebrated their first Masses in the little chapel at St. Asaph, served by their father, wearing vestments embroidered at their sister's convent, their happy family being their first communicants and receiving their first blessings.

After spending two years as minister of Beaumont College near Windsor, Father Henry Kerr, as he was now called, was sent in 1877 on the mission to Garnet Hill, Glasgow, from whence he was transferred the next year as military chaplain to Cyprus, almost as soon as it had been acquired by the British Government. His sense of order and discipline revolted against many things there of which he became cognizant and which drew from him the remark: "These soldiers are great bunglers. There is such a lot of red tape and nonsense. A regiment ought to be like a ship, complete in itself, whereas there are half a dozen departments, all pulling against each other and independent, and costing the country thousands. The number of staff and departmental people looking after this handful of troops is simply ridiculous. Four hundred sailors or marines would not cost a third, and would be twice as efficient. May the Lord save the British Army!" Though he found it hard "to stir up the British soldier," the inevitable red-tape raising obstacles to getting hold of the men who always seemed on duty, he was consoled and edified by the attention of some, like barrack-sergeant Watts "a holy and mortified man, in the Church by 5.30 every morning regularly" and by the readiness with which twenty men, "all for love," worked at putting up a sanctuary of Our Lady of Mount Troodos, the altar and predella of which were from the ruins of St. Epiphanius' Catholic Chapel. Fever prevailed but he escaped the contagion, which drew from him the observation: "God has preserved me, a priest

propter alios, and if I could only stir up a zeal for souls, who knows that He would not spare me still."

He had recourse to the Jesuit's favorite method in pursuing his apostolate. He set up a school. There was then not a single English man or woman teaching in Cyprus. The Civil Commissioner, Colonel Warren, spoke to him in no measured terms of the degradation of the Greek clergy and their exactions and how he was striving to enlighten the people and raise them from their state of ignorance and misery. Having vainly urged education on the Greek clergy, he turned to Father Kerr and said: "You are first in the field and you have virgin soil. I promise you plenty of opposition. The Greek clergy will be furious, but I don't care whether you make five converts or fifty thousand, as long as you raise them from their state of ignorance and abject misery. Talk of the nations of India and the East! These poor people are ground down far worse." Father Kerr assured him of the interest of the Holy See and the Society. Three poor French nuns were trying to promote female education, and to supplement their efforts he proposed to his Provincial the establishment of a college at Limassol, asking for "an Englishman fresh from his Greek," and "a foreigner able to write and preach well in Greek, French or Italian." It awakens sad and regretful thoughts to learn that the Englishman was Father (then Mr.) Tyrrell, who closes some interesting reminiscences of Father Kerr with these words: "Though I never wrote to him or heard from him, I always remembered him distinctly and affectionately, as I do now; and I owe more to the impression made upon me by the first Jesuit of my acquaintance, my self-constituted novice-master, and kindest of despots, than perhaps would be fair to others for me to state explicitly." It would have been well for Father Tyrrell if he had been always faithful to the teaching of such a master.

The college was short-lived, and, after a fortnight's pilgrimage to the Holy Land in company with the Provincial, he went to India as Chaplain to the Viceroy, Lord Ripon; though, were he free to consult his own inclinations, he would have preferred to accept Gordon's invitation to join him in the ill-fated Khartoum expedition, to evangelize the natives, a task after his own heart; for, as his cousin observed, between Gordon's lofty, chivalrous and deeply religious character and his own, there was much similarity. Gordon resigned his position of private secretary to the Viceroy, declaring that "he would not, could not stay amid all this splendor and luxury, while so many millions had not daily bread." In vain Bishop Meurin, S. J., of Bombay, urged the good he might do in ameliorating the condition of 150,000,000 and more. "Gordon's heart" wrote

Father Kerr "was elsewhere, and as he spoke of his African boys he became quite excited and the tears rolled down his cheeks. The Bishop was much interested in him. Not unnaturally his lordship thought he was troubled in mind, possibly about faith. But Gordon, alas, has made a religion to himself, and seems firmly fixed. A little book of Scripture maxims is his guide. In doubts and difficulties he opens, read and acts accordingly. He is a sincere Christian; this morning he said to me: 'The Viceroy came to me before seven o'clock with a paper, which won't do, for if a man does not get through his prayers before breakfast the whole day goes wrong.' He has a contempt for money—as I write not possessing £80—most disinterested, very just, liberal-minded, and large-hearted, loving Catholic missionaries because for the most part he finds them men of sacrifice and principle."

During his stay in India he fell ill, so ill that his case seemed hopeless and Dr. Anderson, the Viceroy's physician, was asked by a member of the staff at what hour the funeral had better be fixed, interments taking place shortly after death in that climate. It was one of the most critical cases of typhoid fever that came under that doctor's observation. One night, feeling that the patient could not live twenty-four hours, in a lucid interval the latter looked at him imploringly and said: "Don't deny me the Sacraments." He at once sent for Father Patrick,¹³ and, though it was the middle of the night, called up the Viceroy, and the last Sacraments were administered, his Excellency being present. After his recovery, which his sister Henrietta ascribed to prayers to Our Lady, invoked as *Mater Admirabilis*, he made a tour of the Himalayas along with the Viceroy and Lady Ripon and their suite. Among the many *notanda* in his diary of this tour we read: "People at home little know the trials of conventual life in the plains and bazaars of India—if they did they would be more generous with the subjects." Among the ecclesiastical notabilities he met was the Capuchin Bishop Pesci, Vicar Apostolic of Patna, to whom the Christian colony at Bhopal was causing anxiety, a mission which owed its origin to a French adventurer, who by military service and by marriage became connected with the State and acquired wealth. It was then in great danger, for the Begum's Consort was a bigoted Mussulman was trying to make Bhopal the chief Mahommedan State in India. His counsels prevailed, and the Christians suffered accordingly. There was then a crisis owing to the death of the venerable Madame Doolane, the chief of the colony, and the Nawab was doing his best to

¹³ Rev. P. F. Knaresboro, O. S. F. C., who died some years ago immediately after celebrating Mass.

break the entail and banish church and school, hoping, no doubt, by that way to banish religion too. Of Rangoon he notes: "The Patronage of St. Thomas does not extend thus far, as there is no trace of the saint's footsteps here, yet up country on the confines of Western China (Singanfu), there is a remarkable Christian monument, a cross with a lengthened inscription of the eighth century, set up by the Nestorians." Another notability was Bishop Bigandet, Vicar-Apostolic of Southern Burmah, who had spent the greater part of his life in the East, and was quite the father of modern Burmah. Deeply versed in Oriental literary and speaking many languages, he had made Buddhism the study of his life, spending twenty years in Upper Burmah, unravelling the mysteries of Gautama and his teaching, laying bare the errors of this extraordinary religious system in a work, entitled "The Legend of Gautama," the standard book on Buddhism, then exciting much interest in Europe. He found the Bishop "very interesting—a man of reason with a well balanced judgment and practical, generous views, meting out merit for good done to all, even to those not of the household of the faith. And this is a spirit," he adds, "much wanted in the East, not only among those without the fold, but *within*. Would that we could destroy false gods and false worship like the Israelites of old; but as that can not be (now at least) the lamb must lie down with the lion, and the sheep graze with the goats (though they need not fraternize), and in the end God will sever them. This charity Archbishop Goethals is doing his best to sow, or perhaps I should say nourish, for we must not think it does not already exist. May God give, and give speedily the increase, for at present many lambs seem neither to suckle nor even to lie down with their mother. A reception by the Viceroy of the Burman elders prompted the following reflection: "Here there is no aristocracy, but the people reverence the King without measure and offer him 'shiko' the highest homage. This we are checking, but as we teach them nothing in its place they at present make a mixed ungraceful act of homage, and rising generations will probably do nothing. Our ideas of civilization are certainly queer; we wink at gnats and swallow camels. Why don't we make them adore the true God and let stay their patriarchal government, picturesque dress and simple customs? No; we tyrannize over them in trifles, and, as far as we are concerned, prepare them for everlasting tyranny hereafter. If we encouraged them to follow God half as much as we do loyalty to ourselves, municipal government and the like Western notions, we should do well." He thus sums up his impressions of Burma: "It is an interesting country, so different from India. All so light and gay,

chiefly owing perhaps to three causes, as compared with India; the emancipation of womankind; the absence of any practical degradation in their religious worship; temporal prosperity. There are no rich and no poor, and the people so generous that even a stranger is welcome in every house, and may travel through the land without a penny and without being even questioned." This reminds one of Longfellow's description of Acadia, "where the richest were poor and the poorest lived in abundance;" where there were no "fierce extremes" accentuating progress and poverty, no *auri sacra fames*, no vast accumulation of wealth in the hands of a comparative few, disarranging the moral, social and commercial equilibrium.

One of the aspects of Anglo-Indian life that struck him was that there was very little of Christmas to be seen or heard outside the walls of the Church. "In another decade of years," he wrote despondingly, "there will be nothing, and the generation after that won't know what it means, so fast is indifference and forgetfulness of God covering the face of Christmas, in spite of mince pies and Christmas cards." He discussed the religious question in season and out of season with high and low and gave them books on Catholic doctrine. The Hindoos frequently remarked that theirs is a sacrificial, ceremonious worship, and they are attracted to us. "Half a dozen preachers" he says, "who could speak fluently the native tongue, posted in the different centres of the north, would, I doubt not, get a hearing; not only for their cause, but because so few Europeans make the language *their own*." Of his five years work in India the late Marquis of Ripon wrote: "Of course I who knew him so well and owed him so much, loved him truly, but all who came within his reach were attracted to him, and I have seen many men, soldiers, civilians and travellers, who have all spoken in terms of the highest praise of him and his work." A friend high in office said of him: "He seemed to me one of the most attractive and lovable characters I ever met in a man. This world can ill afford to lose such examples." Sir Donald Stewart thus sketches him in outline: "To me Father Kerr was an impressive personality; in bearing and conversation he was wholesome and manly, with charming manners. His conduct as the chaplain of a Catholic Viceroy was prudent and circumspect to an extraordinary degree, and as I was a member of Lord Ripon's government during the whole of his Viceroyalty, I had special opportunities of observation in regard to matters ecclesiastical."

Before he returned to England in 1885, Lord Ripon's term of office having ended in January of that year, Father Kerr's father and mother, his brother Francis, and his sister Henrietta had passed

away; the last word addressed to him on earth by the sister whom he loved and by whom he was beloved with more than a natural affection, whose saintly death terminated a lingering illness, being this appropriate verse: "Expecta Dominum, viriliter age, et confortetur cor tuum et sustine Dominum." His character and piety were essentially virile. Though the *Times of India* described him as "the most unpriestly-looking of Catholic priests," he was none the less a true priest because he did not obtrude his "priestliness" upon the mixed company in which he frequently found himself. "With Father Kerr" says Lord William Beresford, "was exemplified that it is not what a man says which carries the conviction of the higher, the spiritual life, being the ruling guide and power, but what he *does* and what he *lives*. He was not a great talker, and seldom talked on so-called religious subjects unless invited to do so. But it was impossible to be with him without feeling his own personal goodness; and he carried charity and piety with him. He was never a damper to healthy and wholesome conviviality and sociability, but his very presence ensured that both these adjectives would be ensured, and at the same time would not be felt to be irksome."

On his return to England, Father Kerr after officiating for some time at the church in Farm street, London, went to Manresa House, Roehampton, for his tertianship or third year's novitiate which all Jesuit priests have to go through before making their final vows. He was next appointed to the church of the Holy Name, Manchester, during the autumn of 1886. It was at this time he heard of his selection by the Holy See as the first Archbishop of Bombay. By his rule every Jesuit is bound to decline ecclesiastical dignities, unless under a special order from the pope. His health, weakened by the climate of India, rendered it impossible for him to return to that country and he was excused. In 1888 he regretfully left Manchester, an active sphere of work which resembled Glasgow, for Bournemouth, which he regarded "as a preparation for death." But the end was not yet, and there was still much work before him. He found the Bournemouth Mission in a sadly disorganized state; he left it in perfect order. One who often co-operated in his parish work says: "There was a strong heroic element in Father Kerr's character which would have made its mark in life, no matter in what line. His grand faith, as well as strength of character, always seemed to me to belong to another century. If St. Teresa had known him, I think she would have seen in him one of those apostolic men whom her great heart, so passionate in its love for God's Church, used to pray for in burning words." His special devotions were to the Blessed Sacrament, the Sacred Heart, and Our Lady, whom he loved with child-

like simplicity. "This simplicity," says the writer¹⁴ just quoted, "the simplicity of a true, strong nature was about all his spirituality; to love his Master, to work for Him, and to die to self more and more. . . He seemed as pleased if any other mission, or any other religious order, got on or prospered as if it had been his own; one felt that the best love of his heart was given to God and to the Catholic Church, the rest was but means to an end. On one occasion only did I see his soul slightly unveiled, as it were. He was speaking about a retreat, and suddenly he began to walk about the room with an unwonted light on his face, and he said, 'Oh, is it not beautiful—does one not feel God so wonderfully near at such times.' His greatest wish seemed to be to keep his personality out of sight. . . He left Bournemouth without bidding any one good-bye. Very early one morning a member of the congregation happened to enter the church alone and noiselessly. There was some one there already. In the dim light, lying prostrate before the picture of the Sacred Heart, was Father Kerr. . . It was no doubt there, that he was saying his 'Summe Domine,'¹⁵ for himself, and there bidding his flock good-bye by placing himself and them in that loving heart forever. An hour or two later he was gone, never to return, knowing, as he wrote to a friend that 'the Cross was before him, but that he went in peace and confidence in answer to the will of God, made known to him through holy obedience.' " Father Delany, his friend of Roman days, who visited him at Bournemouth after an interval of twenty years, saw little change in him. "There was still," he says, "the stamp of the soldier in him—the earnestness, the directness, the simplicity, the firmness of resolve and promptness of action that are the characteristics of the good soldier—and perhaps still more of the good sailor—were plainly visible in the Jesuit, making him all the better representative of his soldier founder, Ignatius."

The cross to which he alluded was his appointment as superior of the Zambesi Mission, which, while it enabled him to realize his spiritual day-dream of devoting himself to the foreign missions, meant severance from country and kindred for the rest of his life. He thus wrote of it to a friend: "We should welcome the particular cross that is given to us. To each it is sent in a different way. Things were too smooth for me at Bournemouth; it required a great effort to keep up to the mark. It is better to have a great trial, and then the consolation of God which always comes to support us in the trial."

¹⁴ The late Baroness Pauline von Hugel.

¹⁵ St. Ignatius' prayer.

He left England on March 4, 1891, for the Cape. True to his love of poverty and mortification, relates his biographer, he had purposely taken his passage by one of the intermediate boats of the Castle line, which seemed to depend more on cargo than passengers; for on reaching Tilbury at what he had been told was the time for departure, he found that the *Warwick Castle* had gone in the early morning, and that the passengers were expected to join her by crossing in the night boat for Queensborough. "This, however," writes Father William Kerr, who was with him, "gave the brothers a long day together, and I shall never forget the parting at the close of it, when Schomberg, in his humility, knelt down in a corner of the cold, dreary custom-house shed to make his confession and receive absolution from me before the midnight train arrived."

The Zambesi Mission dates back to the saintly Jesuit Father Silveira, who, on March 15, 1561, shed his blood in propagating the faith in the vast tract of Africa which lies between the Limpopo and Zambesi rivers, and whose body was traditionally believed by the natives to have been miraculously preserved on an island in the latter river. In 1875, Dr. Ricards, Vicar-Apostolic of the Eastern District of Cape Colony handed over St. Aidan's College, Grahamstown, to the Society, the first step towards the Christianization of the interior by forming the basis of a great missionary system. The limits of the Zambesi Mission or Apostolic Prefecture were defined by Pope Leo XIII in December 1878 and fixed by the Rescript of Propaganda dated February 7, 1879. It comprises an immense area of 250,000 English miles. The work assigned to Father Kerr was twofold; the college and mission work in Cape Colony and the Zambesi Mission proper. He reached South Africa after a long series of misfortunes had almost annihilated the missions—Matabele domination having ruined all previous efforts—until the development of the Chartered Company afforded an opportunity to the missionaries of accompanying the pioneer expedition into Mashonaland and enabled them to make permanent establishments at Salisbury, Victoria, and other stations. Father Kerr's prudence and zeal gave the work a fresh start, so that ever since the missionaries have stood well with the administration and the settlers alike, two things indispensable to ensure success. Writing from Vryburg he says: "Africa is a blighted continent. The shadow of Ham still covers the country and its crew, nor is it easily dispelled, but we must persevere." Later on he wrote: "This is a benighted country, and there is not much piety even among the faithful, and the Kafirs are less inclined than most to care for any religion at all. Under these circumstances a missionary's work is without much fruit. . . By God's grace we may

sow, but we shall not reap. We sailors do a good deal of roughing it in our time, but it is child's play to pioneering in tropical Africa." He set a high value upon the work of the nuns, which is invaluable. "A solitary priest," he says, "can do little, and much valuable time and many lives have been lost in consequence. Now, it is an acknowledged principle that to found a mission in South Africa without a convent is useless, and in every station they are to be found." He is equally broad-minded and generous in his recognition of the wonderful work accomplished by the Oblates under Dr. Jolivet, and by the Trappist monks and Dominican and Trappist nuns. One who met him at Vryburg in 1892 says: "I shall never forget his face. It then bore the marks of hardship and cares. But it was the expression that so impressed me with its strength and calm determination. It was the resolute face of one who says, 'It is hard, but I will go through with it to the end, come what may!' It was the face of a martyr." In his long and wearisome journeys, trekking over the veldt, he found the Kafirs docile enough and apt to take on the manners of their masters; they all stood up and blessed themselves round the campfire before and after meals, and were very attentive at Mass on Sundays. "A taste and talent for language," he again declares, "is of the greatest importance. Every hour we feel the want, and it is sad to think of so many opportunities passing by." The scarcity of proper food was one of the chief trials they had to undergo in those long, weary journeys. It struck Father Colley as very wonderful that a man in mid-life, like Father Kerr, could face such a life as this. "Young men," he writes, "find it very trying to live long out in the wilds in this way, and here he is travelling backwards and forwards, and never seeming to think of himself, in order to know the mission and make the most prudent arrangements for the success of the work." Constant attacks of fever coming on an already enfeebled system, with the depression induced by the South African climate, made the work very difficult for him, but never for a moment was his bodily weakness allowed to interfere. "His ill health," writes one of his brother priests, "prevented him from bringing out his *natural* qualities to their best, but perhaps it brought out in stronger relief his acquired virtues, which were especially prayer and a love of poverty." No primitive Franciscan was ever more devoted to poverty. All the world knows how the Saint of Assisi revered and cherished his "Lady Poverty," which he spiritually espoused. This modern Jesuit's love of holy poverty was on a par with that of the thirteenth century saint who infused his spirit and teaching into the mediæval world he reformed. Father Kerr proclaimed himself "a thorough believer in Mother Poverty." In his

letters to one of the mission fathers he says: "We can only do good according to our constitutions by humility, self-contempt, self-sacrifice. God will not bless good done in any other way. We must commence silently and quietly with much prayer and self-denial. Good must be done according to the spirit of the exercises; good done in any other way is false and fickle, and to be despised by us. Our weakness is our strength. *Viriliter* age A thousand miles *on end* in a wagon will turn out a man either a sinner or a saint." Another time he said to his companion: "We ought to live mortified lives to draw God's blessing on our work. Why should we not be other St. Francis Xaviers? I propose that we live on native food." One who worked under him says: "He was a religious not only when he preached, or when he gave an exhortation to his community, or when he offered the Holy Sacrifice, but also in the everyday routine of life, in his intercourse with his brethren in religion as well as in his dealings with people of the world with whom his duties brought him in almost daily contact. Add to this, also, an intense missionary spirit, a spirit which was always on the watch, and seemed never to be satisfied unless it was communicating some of its own warmth to hearts as warm, or altogether grown cold. . . . An inflexible consciousness of duty governed his every action." Another fellow-Jesuit says: "Father Kerr appeared to me a remarkable illustration of the manliness of sanctity. He was a thorough *man* in his vigor, his power of command, his force of character, his power of endurance, his intense straightforwardness, his superiority to all human respect, his overpowering sense of duty; and to all this he joined what is also a necessary element in perfect manliness, a strong power of sympathy, a profound humility and an unswerving obedience to his superiors. He was one of the most loyal men I ever met, one of the most unselfish, one of the heartiest and most sincere. He had a beautiful face—one that told of a noble character—not beautiful with any remarkable physical beauty, but deriving its attractiveness from the beautiful soul within."

During the last year of his life he spent his time chiefly at Salisbury and Buluwayo. He suffered much from ill health and insomnia, and hoped to be relieved of his office as superior and allowed to work as a simple missionary, but always desiring, as he said, "to lay his bones in South Africa." To one who suggested that it would be well if the missionaries were sent home to England every year to recruit, he replied, "When we come out we make the sacrifice of our lives. We must work until God calls us." He was wishful of leaving the world on the day on which he had entered it—the Feast of the Assumption, which in 1895 fell on a Thursday—but the "one

clear call" did not come until the Sunday within the octave, when he passed away without a struggle, ceasing to breathe so gently that Father Ryan, superior of St. Aidan's College, was praying with him, as he thought, for five minutes after his last breath before he felt sure that he was dead. He was laid to rest in Grahamstown Cemetery, alongside Father Weld, who had received him into the Society. "Martyrdom," says St. Jerome, "does not consist only in the shedding of blood, but also in serving God the Lord with an irreproachable and fervent spirit." In this sense Father Kerr was a true martyr, as he was a truly typical Jesuit. In the words of one of his naval friends, "He sacrificed a promising career for that which seemed to him 'the better part,' and gained a martyr's crown in the dismal land to which duty had devoted him"—thus realizing a desire he had in common with his saintly sister when they unitedly prayed for the grace of martyrdom.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork. Ireland.

THE BATTLES OF THEOLOGY.

I.

SOME years since a far-seeing English statesman-philosopher wrote: "The decisive battles of Theology are fought beyond its frontiers. It is not over purely religious controversies that the cause of religion is lost or won. The judgments we shall form upon its special problems are commonly settled for us by our general mode of looking at the Universe; and this again, in so far as it is determined by arguments at all, is determined by arguments of so wide a scope that they can seldom be claimed as more nearly concerned with Theology than with the philosophy of science or ethics. . . . With the growth of knowledge Theology has enlarged its borders until it has included subjects about which even the most accomplished theologian of past ages did not greatly concern himself. To the Patristic, Dogmatic and Controversial learning which has always been required, the theologian of to-day must add knowledge at first hand of the complex historical, antiquarian and critical problems presented by the Old and the New Testament, and of the vast and daily increasing literature which has grown up around them. He must have a sufficient acquaintance with the comparative history of religions; and in addition to all this, he must be competent to deal with those scientific and philosophical questions which

have a more profound and permanent bearing on Theology even than the results of critical and historical scholarship."¹

Even a cursory survey of modern thought shows plainly that the heyday of Renanesque flippancy has passed, and that religion has little to fear from openly blasphemous utterances. Non-Catholics, and even determined adversaries of all religion, have become quite tolerant of our claims. From the realm of coarse abuse and stinging irony the fight has been transferred to the field of calm reasoning. And when a W. James, on whom, one would at times believe, a part of Renan's mantle has fallen, proclaims in true Voltairean style, "A God who can relish such superfluities of horror (the evils of this world) is no God for human beings to appeal to. His animal spirits are too high,"² we shrug our shoulders at the gratuitous insult, and care little to argue with him further, because he puts himself outside the pale of reason and calm judgment. The battle has been transferred to the field of science and philosophy. And if this change of front allows of a more manly attack and defence, it also calls into play more skillful tactics on both sides. It demands a clear vision of the weak points in the enemy's serried ranks; he is intrenched in a position he has chosen himself, and we are to meet him on his own ground with weapons at least equal to his own.

As Balfour remarks, scientific and philosophical questions have just now a more profound and permanent bearing on Theology than even the results of critical and historical scholarship. Proofs of this contention could be adduced in great number. Let one striking example suffice.

Loisy's critical and historical conclusions in the domain of exegesis are in the last analysis grounded on Kantian ideology. The resurrection of Christ, *e. g.*, cannot be admitted as a historically valuable fact, because the human mind is constitutionally unable to know objective phenomena with certainty. The laws that govern the mind's operations do not allow it to go beyond or outside of itself, in order to assert anything objectively with a positive absence of doubt. Hence, historical facts such as Christ's resurrection may well be an object of belief, but they can never be objects of scientifically provable knowledge. No quarrel is had with the methods or conclusions of modern historical criticism; they are valuable in the field of phenomena; they prove that certain facts have taken place. But underlying both these facts and the historical methods that establish them there is an ultimate problem embracing them

¹ Balfour, "Foundations of Belief," pp. 2, 3.

² W. James, "Pragmatism," p. 143.

both: the problem of knowledge itself, its nature and its limitations. And if you admit Kant's solution of it, Loisy's theories are thoroughly consistent.

Philosophical theories akin to those underlying Loisy's historical criticism have more and more come to be made the basis of Theology. Every other science has its own method of investigation and its own established basic principles, which no scientist would think of controverting. Witness the inductive method in natural sciences; witness the atomic laws in chemistry, the principles of gravity and the law of inertia in physics. But with Theology it is no longer thus; and a great many thinkers of our day, when speculating on problems of religion, approach them in an aprioristic fashion, in the light of their own personal world-view. Reasoning from their inner consciousness, they establish the conditions and limits of religious truths, in harmony with the system of philosophy they happen to hold. Hence the manifold vagaries whose bewildering array unsettles the minds of the multitudes. President Eliot's "Religion of the Future" is a conspicuous example of this disregard of all scientific methods. Even to a superficial reader it must appear as a concoction of mere glittering prophecies. He has reduced religious truths and practices to all too simple and primitive formulas to make any effective and lasting appeal to cultured minds. After the first enthusiasm his pronouncements may have elicited will have died away.

In contrast with this arbitrary Theology of President Eliot stands the attempt of Professor Boyce, of Harvard, at interpreting "what is vital in Christianity."³ His is at least an earnest effort at ascertaining fundamentals, that gives proof of sober thinking and no prophesying. And the representative position he has for many years occupied in the fields of American philosophical speculation gives weight to his utterances as the expression of a school of thought the adherents of which fairly control the non-Catholic university teaching in this country.

II.

When Kant gave to the world his two great Critiques, he laid the foundation of a new world-view destined to become as far-reaching and as influential in shaping the thought of man as scholasticism was in the heyday of its power.

Positivism started out as a reaction against his and his successors' extravagant claims; it called the mind back from wild metaphysical speculations to the exclusive study of concrete facts. But

³ *Harvard Theological Quarterly*, October, 1909, p. 408, ff.

by pointing out the only conditions under which knowledge is supposedly possible, idealism was enabled to influence positivism to such an extent that it became tainted with phenomenism; the concerted strength of the two movements gave rise to an idealistic and subjectivistic monism, dominant in the intellectual atmosphere of the day.

It is as a follower of this philosophical creed, under its inspiration, and with its principles as guide, that Professor Royce elaborates his system of Theology. "Most of you," he writes, "have heard of some such doctrine as the theory of Divine Immanence. Some of you are aware that such an interpretation of the nature of God is called philosophical idealism."⁴ According to this doctrine "God is indeed a spirit and a person, but He is not a being who exists in separation from the world, simply as its external creator. He expresses himself in the world, and the world is His own life, as He consciously lives it out. . . . The distinction between God and the world implies no separation. Our world is the fragmentary phenomenon that we see. God is the conscious meaning that expresses itself in and through the totality of all phenomena. The world, taken as a mass of happenings in time, of events, of natural processes, of single lives, is nowhere, and at no time, any complete expression of the divine will. But the entire world, of which our own world is a fragment—the totality of what is past, present and future, the totality of what is physical and of what is mental, of what is temporal and of what is enduring—this entire world is present at once to the divine consciousness as a single whole, and this whole is what the absolute chooses as his own expression, and what he is conscious of choosing as his own life. Like the Logos of the Fourth Gospel, this entire world is not only with God, but is God God and His world are one. And this unity is not a dead natural fact. It is the unity of a conscious life, in which, in the course of infinite time, a divine plan, an endlessly complex and yet perfectly definite spiritual idea gets expressed in the lives of countless finite beings, and yet with the unity of a single universal life."⁵

Our philosophical conception of God and His nature is the common meeting ground on which all Theology builds its systems of religious doctrines and practices. This point, therefore, established, we can go on to ascertain accordingly what these doctrines and practices shall be.

Idealism as a philosophical theory sets out to establish the conditions under which knowledge becomes possible and valuable. Ap-

⁴ *Ibid*, p. 439.

⁵ *Ibid*, pp. 439-440.

proaching Theology in this same attitude of mind, it consistently sets out to inquire with Professor Royce "What sort of faith or practice is it that can be called vital to any religion; what are to be distinguished as the vital elements of Christianity?"⁶

Taking for granted that all religion is a man-made institution, Professor Royce sets out to answer his first question, "What sort of faith or practice is it that can be called vital to any religion," by investigating the genesis of various primitive and higher religions.

In primitive religions, he holds, the religious practices seem in general to be more important, and more vital for the whole structure of the religious life, than are the conscious beliefs which accompany these practices. Men come to believe as they do regarding the nature of some supernatural being, largely in consequence of the fact that they have first come to follow some course of conduct, not for any conscious reason at all, but merely for some instinctive tendency which by accident has determined this or that special expression.

On the higher levels of religious development—higher because more self-conscious—where the inner life comes to be emphasized, the term "dissenter" often means, in popular use, a person who will not attend this church, or who will not conform to its practices. Nevertheless, upon this higher level conformity of practice is no longer enough; the religious body itself also requires the acceptance of a profession of faith, and this acceptance must be not only a formal act, but a sincere one. Here, then, in the life of the higher religions, belief tends to come into a position of primacy. Now, these higher religions, especially as represented in their highest type of teachings, are deeply concerned in overcoming and in reducing to unity this conflict of formal observance with genuine faith wherever this conflict arises. And what this solution supposes to be most vital to the highest religion is the union of faith and works through a complete spirituality.⁷

But this proposal of a solution thus stated appears to the modern mind rather as the formulation of a new problem than as the end of the whole matter. For if this higher unity of faith and practice is indeed the goal of the highest religions, how far are many of us from seeing our way toward adapting any such solution to our own cases. The modern world is full of suggestions of doubt regarding the articles of the traditional creeds. The moral problems of our time, full of new perplexities, confuse us with regard to what ought to be done. The Church is no longer one visible institution with a single authoritative constitution, but a variety of social

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 408.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

organizations, each with its own traditions and values. The power of religion to unify the whole man is no longer so presented to us by any one body of religious teaching that we can simply accept it from tradition (since in the modern world we must both act and think as individuals for ourselves).

How, then, to interpret this program in terms which will make it of live and permanent meaning for the modern world, this is precisely the religious problem of to-day. Now, with regard to the second question, "How does this problem regarding what is vital to a religion appear when we turn to the special case of Christianity?" Why Professor Royce should single out Christianity is not apparent, because he has already put it on a level with other "higher religions" or "world religions" that lay especial emphasis upon the inner life, such as Buddhism and Mohammedanism.⁸

But the answer is interesting,—and twofold.

The first answer consists in holding that what is vital about Christianity is simply the spiritual attitude and the doctrine of Christ as He Himself taught this doctrine and this attitude in the body of His authentic sayings and parables, and as He lived all this out in His own life. All in Christianity that goes beyond this, all that came to the consciousness of the Church after Christ's own teaching had been uttered and finished, either is simply a paraphrase, an explanation or an application of the original doctrine of Christ, or else is not vital, is more or less unessential, mythical, or at the very least external. Grasp the spirit of Christ's own teaching, interpret life as He interpreted it, and live out this interpretation of life as completely as you can, imitating Him, and then you are in essence as Christian.⁹

But this solution is unsatisfactory. To assert that only that is vital to Christianity which is contained in the recorded sayings of Christ, to return to a purely primitive Christianity, is obviously to view Christ's doctrine as He Himself did not view it. His recorded sayings are in the Master's mind only part of a program which, as the events showed, related not only to the individual soul and its salvation, but to the reform of the whole existing and visible social order. He certainly meant the kingdom of heaven to include the inner transformation of each soul by the divine love; but He also certainly conceived this spiritual transformation in terms of some sort of Messianic mission which was related to a miraculous coming transformation of human society. The spiritual kingdom of heaven the transformation of the inner life which the sayings teach, is in-

⁸ *Ibid*, p. 418.

⁹ *Ibid*, pp. 422-423.

deed a genuine part, yes, a vital part of Christianity, but it is by no means the whole of what is vital to it.¹⁰

The second answer seems to Professor Royce to be more to the point. It holds that what is vital about Christianity depends upon regarding the mission of the life of Christ as an organic part of a divine plan for the redemption and salvation of man. While the doctrine of Christ is indeed an essential part of His mission, one cannot rightly understand, above all one cannot apply the teachings of Christ, one cannot live out the Christian interpretation of life, unless one first learn to view the person of Christ, its true relation to God and His work, as an entirely unique revelation and expression of God's will. The work of Christ culminated, however, in His death. Hence, as the historic Church has always maintained, it is the cross of Christ that is the symbol of whatever is most vital about Christianity.

Moreover the work of Christ was essential to the whole relation of His own teaching to the life of men. The needed transformation of human nature, the change of life which, according to Christ's sayings, is necessary as a condition for entering the kingdom of heaven, is made possible through the effects of the life and death of Christ. This life and death were events by which man's redemption was made possible, whereby the atonement for sin was accomplished. In brief, what is vital to Christianity includes an acceptance of the two cardinal doctrines of the incarnation and the atonement.¹¹

But we must be on our guard lest we accept this answer in the spirit of "the historical Church." It "must be rightly interpreted, for the modern mind has come to be unwilling to accept as literal reports of historical facts, certain well-known legends. But if the tale is not literally true, its deeper meaning may be absolutely true; and it is the genuine and eternal truth which lies behind the symbol that constitutes what is indeed vital to Christianity."¹² "I personally regard the supernatural narratives in which the Church embodied its faith, simply as symbols, the product, indeed, of no man's effort to deceive, but of the religious imagination of the great constructive ages of the early Church. The truth which lies behind these symbols is capable of perfectly rational statement; this truth is independent of the legends; it relates to eternal spiritual facts¹³ which never merely

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 432.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 424.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 434.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 438.

happened but are such as to determine anew in every age the relation of the faithful to God.”¹⁴

We have seen already how from a philosophical standpoint we must conceive the existence and nature of God: God and this world are one, and this unity is not a dead natural fact; it is the unity of a conscious life, in which in the course of infinite time a divine plan gets expressed in the lives of countless finite beings and yet with the unity of a single universal life.

But here the question at once arises—the centuries-old question which has never been solved by human reason—Why, if the world is the divine life embodied, is there so much evil in it; why is the world as we know it so full of the unreasonable, while we remain all the time conscious of the reasonableness and the unity of the divine life?

Professor Royce has his own solution of the problem: The value of suffering lies in the spiritual triumphs that the endurance and overcoming of evil can bring. And of all the spiritual triumphs that the presence of evil makes possible, the noblest is that which is won when a man is ready not merely to bear the ills of fortune tranquilly if they come, as the stoic moralists required their followers to do, but when one is willing to suffer vicariously, freely, the ills that he might have avoided, but that the cause to which he is loyal and the errors and sins that he himself did not commit call upon him to suffer in order that the world may be brought nearer to its destined union with the divine.

And the true doctrine of the atonement is, in its essence, simply the conception of God's nature which this solution of the problem of evil requires.

“First, God expresses Himself in this world of finitude, incarnates Himself in this realm of imperfection but does so in order that through finitude and imperfection, and sorrow and temporal loss, he may win in the eternal world (that is, precisely in the conscious unity of His whole life) His spiritual triumph over evil. In this triumph consist His highest good and ours. I do not say that we, just as we naturally are, are already the true and complete incarnation of God. No, it is in overcoming evil, in rising above our natural unreasonableness, in looking toward the divine unity, that we seek what Eckhart so well expressed when he said, ‘Let God be born in the soul.’ Hence the doctrine of the incarnation is no doctrine of the natural divinity of man. It is the doctrine which teaches that the world-will desires our unity with the universal purpose, that God will be born in us and through our consent, that the whole

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 435.

meaning of our life is that it shall transmute transient and temporal values into eternal meanings. Humanity becomes conscious God incarnate only in so far as humanity looks Godwards—that is, in the direction of the whole unity of the rational spiritual life.

“And the true doctrine of the atonement seems to me simply this: We, as we temporally and transiently are, are destined to win our union with the divine only through learning to triumph over our own evil, over the griefs of fortune, over the unreasonableness and the sin that now beset us. This conquest we never accomplish alone. When you sorrow, remember that God sorrows—sorrows in you, since in all your finitude you are still a part of His life; sorrows for you, since it is the intent of the divine spirit, in the plan of its reasonable world, that you should not remain what you now are; and sorrows too in waiting for your higher fulfilment, since indeed the whole universe needs your spiritual triumph for the sake of its completion.

“On the other hand, this doctrine of the atonement means that there is never any complete spiritual triumph over sorrow which is not accompanied with the willingness to suffer vicariously; that is, with the will, not merely to endure bravely, but to give one’s life as a ransom for one’s cause, to use one’s bitterest and most crushing grief as a means towards the raising of all life to the divine level.”¹⁵

“To sum up in two theses: First God wins perfection through expressing Himself in a finite life and triumphing over and through its very finitude. And secondly, our sorrow is God’s sorrow. God means to express Himself by winning us through the very triumph over evil to unity with the perfect life. These two theses express, I believe, what is vital in Christianity.” Thus Professor Royce concludes his expose. But while applauding his candor and dispassionate treatment of his subject, Christians in general, and Catholics especially, will strongly disagree with his conclusions.

That these conclusions are the outcome not of any anti-religious bias, not of any wilful juggling with historical data, but the logical result of a particular philosophical world-view, is evident from the outset, and Professor Royce is at no pains to conceal the fact. For many years past he has been in this country one of the influential exponents of *Idéalism*, the philosophy which, under various guises and names, is undoubtedly the leading system of thought outside of the Catholic Church.

To the coarse materialism of the eighteenth century Kant dealt a deadly blow. Vogt, Buchner and their disciples made an attempt to rehabilitate it on a more scientific basis towards the middle of the

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 444-445.

nineteenth century, but Idealism finally asserted its superiority and won the day.

But at the price of a glaring inconsistency Kant had admitted as a matter of belief—the existence of a personal God. It is even possible that, as some have maintained, he sought thus perpetually to safeguard this cardinal doctrine from all attacks of speculative reason. His disciples, however, Hegel and Fichte conspicuously among them, soon realized that consistently there could be no room for such a being in his philosophy, and they were driven to adopt the theory of divine immanence. Hence all post-Kantian and neo-Kantian Idealism is tainted with monism, thus doing away with the “supernatural” in the old meaning of the word.

God is immanent in the world; God and the world are one; all manifestations of life and being are but realizations of the divine in its evolution towards an ultimate perfection. And manifestly, miracles become impossible in as far as they imply the intervention of an extra-mundial being. The historical reality of happenings known by that name need not be questioned; they need not be explained away as delusions of ignorant minds; whether they happened or not, their supernatural character is out of question, but their true value for us is none the less real, and is to be found in the teachings they embody, and which we need to interpret and to live out.

Christ's life and teachings, judged in this light, must consistently be brought down to the level of the natural, and whatever cannot be thus compressed within the limits of this given philosophy is readily considered as an extraneous accretion to pure Christianity. In return, the fascinating doctrine of Christ, than which the world never produced one more perfect, His high ideals of morality, His vicarious suffering for sinful humanity, are exalted as sublime and inspiring ideals in the midst of the evils and trials and disappointments that surround us in this world. “The true and highest value of the spiritual world consists in the triumph over suffering, over sorrow and over unreasonableness. Sorrow, wisely encountered and freely borne, is one of the most precious privileges of the spiritual life. There is a certain lofty peace in triumphing over sorrow, which brings us to a consciousness of whatever is divine in life in a way that mere joy, untroubled and unwon, can never make known to us. Perfect through suffering—that is the universal, the absolutely necessary law of the higher spiritual life.”¹⁶

Nay, it would seem even that the historical person of Christ is called into question since the incarnation is viewed as a “timeless

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 441.

fact" which is not necessarily true, but which, under the form of a symbol, conveys a deeper meaning, which is absolutely true. "We certainly know little regarding the life of the historical Christ; He is a being whose nature and whose reported supernatural mission seem to be involved in doubtful mysteries."¹⁷ But whatever the modern mind may admit or reject with regard to the historical Christ, the birth, the incarnation of God occurs in every soul and eternally. Christ coming into this world means our becoming aware of the eternal birth; that is, the eternal relation of the real soul to the real God.

It is readily seen that a criticism of Professor Royce's views involves a criticism of the fundamental tenets of Idealism. If the human mind is a law unto itself, and in every way independent of the objective realities of an external world, theological certitude also is ruled by the inexorable laws of the categories, and religious truths are only subjectively valuable. And Professor Royce's views are a confirmation of the position taken by Professor Eucken, of Berlin, some years ago, when, in the revival of scholastic philosophy as a successful opponent of Kantism, he saw "*Kampf zweier Welten*," and appealed to all Idealists to rally around the banner of Criticism in a defence of Protestant orthodoxy. For no philosophy fits in better with the primary Protestant principle of private judgment than Kantian subjectivism, although if carried to its logical conclusion it must ultimately destroy even Protestant Christianity. And thus, Professor Royce is fully justified in putting Christianity on a level with Buddhism and Mohammedanism; if subjectivism is the basis of all knowledge, and private judgment the only criterion of its truth, if religion has no longer any historical foundation, we cannot consistently limit the application of the principle to Christianity alone; anyone is, on the strength of it, entitled to his Buddhistic or Mohammedan beliefs.

Professor Royce expresses his final conclusions in terms of Christian theology, but even an orthodox Protestant will scarcely agree with his interpretation of either the doctrine of the incarnation or the atonement. Moreover, instead of meeting the problem of creation, monism does away with it. Faith, as the belief in things unseen, has no longer any meaning. And surely, when Professor Royce calls the divine being of his philosophy "a spirit and a person," he is merely juggling with words: the "personification" of a monistic cosmos is not "a person"; a spirit that is "the totality of what is physical and of what is mental," is at best a contradiction *in terminis*.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 433.

There is no room here for a lengthy discussion of idealistic monism. Our principal aim was to show on what field the battles of Theology are fought at the present day. Much has been written on the subject from the non-Catholic side; it has been brought before the public at large in popular form. No matter how strenuously the destructive utterances have been denied or explained, the issues become clearer every day, and to an interested onlooker it appears undoubtedly as a "Kampf zweier Welten."

Over against this monistic world-view of contemporary Idealism and all the consequences it drags in its wake, stands the scholastic interpretation of the universe as the only reasonable system of thought. It offers a consistent and plausible explanation of the material cosmos, of man, of God; its principles are broad enough to take into account all scientific discoveries, and pliable enough to avoid apriorism and to leave to every science its own particular method.

It is the inherent weakness of Kantian Idealism to be incurably aprioristic. And this weakness appears in the very statement of the problems Professor Royce attempts to solve: What sort of faith or practice is it that can be called vital to any religion; what are to be distinguished as the vital elements of Christianity?

Obviously no scientist ever inquires, What data are vital to the science of chemistry or physics? All data as such are valuable to him; he studies the various phenomena that come under his observation, and by careful induction he builds up the principles and laws that govern his particular science. The data of Christianity are to a certain extent in the nature of scientific facts, the value of which is to be determined, not in the light of an underlying philosophical system, but by scientific historical methods.

This aprioristic method incontinently calls to mind an analogous case in the domain of natural history.

Yves Delage, professor at the Sorbonne, created a sensation some years ago when he wrote,¹⁸ anent the Evolution hypothesis: "I readily admit that we never saw one species produce another, nor transform itself into another; that we have no conclusive observations that such changes ever took place. And by species I mean a true species, fixed as are the natural species we know, and maintaining itself as they do without the interference of man. And this is all the more true of the genus. Yet *I hold evolution by descent to be as certain as if it were objectively demonstrated*. For outside of it there is nothing but the hypothesis of spontaneous generation or

¹⁸ La structure du protoplasme et les theories sur l'heredite, Paris, 1895, p. 184.

the hypothesis of creation, and both are so plainly foreign to science that we cannot afford to honor them with a discussion. . . . I speak here in the first person in order to make it clear that I speak in my own name and not in the name of the transformists, many of whom no doubt will be shocked on reading this declaration. *I am firmly convinced, however, that one is or is not a transformist on account of his philosophic opinions, and not on account of any reasons derived from natural history.*"¹⁹ And we may readily add, one is or is not a believer in the vital theses of Christianity only on account of his philosophical opinions. Hence the intellectual confusion, the despairingly dreary outlook on life and eternity which are the outcome of them call for an adequate remedy—the spreading and up-building of a sound and modern Catholic philosophy.

J. B. CEULEMANS.

Moline, Illinois.

PIUS VII AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

THOUGH Napoleon may not have sent a formal order to arrest Pius VII and carry him away from Rome, Murat and General Miollis apparently considered themselves justified in placing that interpretation on the instructions they had received. It would seem as though the Emperor intended his decrees to be executed only in case the Holy Father refused to submit and sought to incite an insurrection, and it was left to General Miollis to execute them whenever he should think fit.¹ General Radet, in his report to the Minister of War on July 13, 1809, boasted of having contributed to hasten his decision. He felt indignant, he said, on seeing the contempt in which the Imperial Government was held, for the resistance of the Holy Father had augmented his influence to an alarming degree, and there was every fear of a general insurrection. The mountainous districts near Rome were almost completely in the power of bands of insurgent peasants, who were en-

¹⁹ Italics ours.

¹ Correspondance de Napoleon I. publiee par ordre de Napoleon III. Paris, 1864, t. XIX, No. 15,383. Au General Comte Miollis. Schoenbrunn, 19 Juin, 1809. "I have entrusted to you the care of maintaining tranquillity in my Roman States. You must tolerate no obstacle . . . you must arrest, even in the Pope's house, all those who should plot against public tranquillity and the safety of my soldiers."—No. 15,384. A Joachim Napoleon, Roi des Deux-Siciles. Schoenbrunn, 19 Juin, 1809. . . . "No resistance can be tolerated under any pretext. If the Pope, contrary to the spirit of his state and of the Gospel, preaches revolt, and wishes to take advantage of the immunity of his house to have circulars printed, he must be arrested."

couraged in their struggle against the French by the appearance of an English fleet off the coast; and in Rome, where there were but few French troops, the excitement was so great that the new government had thought of withdrawing to Spoleto. Radet placed this gloomy picture of the state of affairs before General Miollis, ascribing it to the opposition made by Pius VII, and demanded that he should be arrested. After the fall of the Empire and the restoration of the Bourbons, Radet drew up a more detailed account of the assault on the Quirinal, for presentation to the Minister of War of Louis XVIII, a copy of which he also sent to the Pope. In this report, dated September 12, 1814, in which he sought to extenuate as much as possible the part he had taken in the arrest of the Holy Father, he states that General Miollis sent for him on July 4, 1809, and told him that, on account of the alarming condition of Rome, he had resolved to send away the Pope, and that he (Radet) had been chosen to execute that plan and should receive written orders to that effect. Radet remonstrated, but his remonstrances were listened to, and he found himself, as he says, placed in the painful alternative of infringing the most sacred rights or of disobeying the orders of his superiors.²

The General made his preparations for taking the Quirinal as carefully as though he were about to attack a fortress instead of a palace inhabited by an aged Pope and a few Cardinals, whose guards had received orders to offer no resistance. To avoid exciting any suspicion, the French garrison was confined to barracks on Wednesday, July 5, and at ten o'clock that night Radet assembled his men, to the number of six hundred, on the Piazza Santi Apostoli, and at the barracks of La Pilotta. Some were sent on patrol round the palace, or were stationed at various posts in the neighborhood, while other detachments, provided with ladders, crowbars and torches, were to give the assault. About eight hundred Neapolitans under General Pagniatelli-Cerchiarro, sent by Murat, had arrived in Rome on the night of the 4th, and to them was assigned the duty of holding the bridges over the Tiber, to guard against any movement on the part of the inhabitants of the Trastevere. General

² *Memoires du General Radet d'apres ses papiers personnels et les Archives de l'Etat*, par A. Combier. St. Cloud, 1892.—The description of the taking of the Quirinal is derived from many sources.—Cardinal Pacca, *Memorie Storiche*. Orvieto, 1843, t. II.—General Radet's reports published in his *Memoirs*.—An inedited document from the Vatican Archives, published by Padre Rinieri in "*Napoleon & Pio VII.*" and two inedited documents, also from the Vatican Archives, published by the "*Courriere d'Italia*" of July 6, 1909.

Miollis assisted at the operations from one of the buildings of the Palazzo Colonna.³

The attack was to have begun at one o'clock, but Radet was informed that an officer of the Papal Guard watched every night until dawn on the circular tower which projects like a bastion close to the great door of the palace. He waited, therefore, until the officer had retired, and gave the signal to advance at 2.35 A. M. The assault was given at three places. One band, guided by a man who had been sent to the galleys for a theft committed while in the Papal service, and who had been pardoned by the Holy Father, scaled the walls of a small court known as the *Cortile della Panetteria*, while another crossed those of the adjoining gardens. General Radet, who led a detachment of forty men, tried to ascend to the roof of *La Dataria* and thus reach the tower, but his ladders broke and he then attempted to force the strongly barricaded wicket in the great door of the palace. One of his subordinates, Colonel Siry, had, in the meantime, broken open a window in the second story of the long line of buildings facing the *Via di Porta Pia*, inhabited by the Papal household. He thence entered the great court with fifty men, threw open the gates and admitted General Radet, who led the detachment up the great staircase and into the private apartments of the Pope, breaking down all the doors which had been closed. In one of these antechambers were assembled the Swiss Guards, who laid down their arms, as the Pope had forbidden them to offer any resistance, and, after forcing open three more doors, the General entered a room separated only by a small corridor from that in which was the Holy Father.

Cardinal Pacca, who had watched all the night, had lain down towards dawn, believing that then there was no longer any danger. He was aroused almost immediately by the news that the French were entering the palace, and from his window he saw in the gardens a number of armed men carrying torches, while others were scaling the walls of the *Panetteria*. He sent at once his nephew, Mgr. Tiberio Pacca, to awaken the Holy Father, who dressed hastily and entered the private audience room, where were soon assembled Cardinal Pacca, Cardinal Desping, Archbishop of Seville and Pro-Vicar of Rome, as well as some secretaries and other members of the Papal

³ General Miollis then gave Radet in writing the order which he had previously given him only verbally: to arrest Cardinal Pacca, and, in case the Pope resisted, to arrest him also, and bring them both to Florence.—“Vous ferez partir sur-le-champ le Cardinal pour France en prenant la route de Florence; dans le cas d'une resistance absolue du Pape vous le conduirez avec, si vous ne pouvez parvenir a le detacher du Cardinal et du parti violent qu'il parait vouloir obstinement garder.”—From the facsimile published by Combier. *Memoires*, p. 318.

household. As the noise made by the breaking open the doors drew near, the terror and confusion of those who surrounded the Holy Father increased; he alone remained perfectly calm. He had brought to him the ring which Pius VI wore when he was carried away from Rome, and he took the seat which he usually occupied when giving audience. When the door of the last antechamber which gave access to the passage leading to the Pope's room was attacked, Cardinal Desping suggested that it should be opened, lest the assailants should rush tumultuously into the presence of the Holy Father. The Abbate Mauri threw the door open, and General Radet, followed by about twenty officers, some gendarmes and some Roman insurgents, entered the apartment. He found the Holy Father seated at his table, the two Cardinals stood beside him, the secretaries and the other officials were grouped in the background. Badet confesses in his report that he felt exceedingly embarrassed and did not know what to say. To gain time, he ordered the soldiers to retire into a neighboring room, and patrols to be sent through the palace to prevent pillage, while he sent a messenger to ask General Miollis what he should do. The answer came in five minutes, that the Pope and Cardinal Pacca were to be arrested and carried away from Rome at once. The General then advanced respectfully towards the Holy Father and said that he had a painful duty to fulfil, but he was bound by his oath of obedience to the Emperor. He therefore, in the name of the government, asked the Holy Father to give up his temporal power. The Pope in a mild tone replied, "I cannot." "If your Holiness," said the General, "would consent to this renunciation, I have no doubt but that everything can be settled and that the Emperor will treat you with every consideration." The Holy Father then rose, and with the majestic dignity of a sovereign and of the Vicar of Christ, said: "I cannot; I must not; I will not. I have promised God to preserve the State belonging to the Church, and I will not break my oath." "I regret, Holy Father," replied the General, "that your Holiness will not consent to this request, as that will expose you to further trouble." The Pope answered: "I have said that nothing shall make me change, and I am ready to lose my life this moment, and to shed the last drop of my blood rather than break the oath which I have made to God." "This resolution, Holy Father," said Radet, "will cause you much inconvenience." "I am resolved," replied the Pope, "and nothing shall turn me aside from this resolution." "If that is the decision of your Holiness," said the General, "I regret the orders which I have received from my sovereign, and my errand." The Pope then said to him in a paternal and compassionate tone, "This errand, my son, will not merit you the blessing

of Heaven." These words seemed to make some impression on Radet, but he said that he had to bring away the Holy Father. "And that," said the Pope, "is the gratitude which your Emperor shows for all that I have done for him, and the reward for all the concessions which I have made to him and to the Church of France."

After some more words from the General, expressing the hope that an interview with the Emperor would settle everything, Cardinal Pacca observed that the Pope required to be accompanied by the persons whose assistance was necessary for the administration of the affairs of the Church, and Radet consented that the Holy Father should draw up a list of names, which he would submit to General Miollis. The list was given to an officer, who returned in a few minutes with the answer that, by the Emperor's order, the Pope and Cardinal Pacca should leave Rome at once with General Radet, and the other persons should follow later. Such was the consternation of the Papal servants, that they were unable to collect the clothes and linen required by the Holy Father, and make any preparations for his journey.

The shattered beams and planks with which the doors had been barricaded still littered the rooms, and the Pope, supported by the two Cardinals and followed by the soldiers and the rabble which had invaded the palace, made his way over them with some difficulty. On arriving at the great gates which open on the *Piazza di Monti Cavallo*, the Holy Father stopped and gave his blessing to Rome. It was then nearly four o'clock; the troops which had patrolled and guarded the environs during the night were drawn up in line and received the Papal blessing with respect, but no Romans were to be seen on the piazza. Before the palace was a small carriage with the blinds drawn down; the Pope and Cardinal Pacca entered it; a gendarme locked the doors, General Radet and another gendarme mounted the box, and, accompanied by an escort, it drove rapidly out of Rome by the *Porta Salara*, and along the walls guarded by pickets of cavalry, to the *Porta del Popolo*. There post horses were in waiting, and from thence it took the road towards Florence.⁴

In spite of the grief which the Holy Father and Cardinal Pacca felt on being thus torn away from Rome and led into captivity, they could not refrain from laughing when, on examining the contents of their purses, only a *papetto* (20 cents) was to be found in that of the Pope, and in the Cardinal's three *grossi* (15 cents). As they

⁴ Radet, *Memoires*, p. 239. Extract from a letter from Murat to Napoleon, 8th July, 1809. "According to the orders of your Majesty which I had forwarded to General Miollis, the Pope and Cardinal Pacca were arrested yesterday morning, and sent away to Florence. One could not be arrested without the other."

had also come away without other clothes than what they wore, they were travelling, as Cardinal Pacca remarked, in truly apostolic fashion. The Cardinal, however, felt some anxiety lest the Holy Father might regret having published the Bull of Excommunication, on account of the fatal consequences it might entail for the Church, and accuse him of having advised that measure. He was, therefore, much relieved when the Pope said to him, with an air of satisfaction, "Cardinal, we did well to issue the Bull of Excommunication on the 10th of June, for otherwise, what should we do now?"⁵

General Radet hoped that by travelling very quickly he might reach Florence before the news of the arrest of the Holy Father became generally known, and thus avoid all danger of disturbances among the people. But the rapid movement caused such suffering to the Pope, that he was allowed to rest at Radicofani, on the Tuscan frontier, where he arrived about ten o'clock that night, until the evening of the following day, by which time most of the persons whose names he had given to General Miollis had arrived from Rome. This delay allowed the news of his captivity to spread through the country, and at the towns through which he passed the people assembled in thousands to ask his blessing. To extricate himself from these menacing crowds, which did not conceal their hostility to the French, General Radet adopted the plan of making them kneel down on one side of the road to receive the Papal benediction; then, while the Holy Father was giving it, the postilions were ordered to start at full gallop, and the carriage was far away while the people were still on their knees. La Certosa, the Carthusian monastery near Florence, where Pius VI had been detained eleven years previously, was reached about ten o'clock on the night of July 8, and General Radet consigned his prisoners to the charge of a Colonel of Gendarmes and of a commissary of police. The Holy Father was so exhausted that he could not reply to the chamberlain whom the Grand Duchess of Tuscany, Eliza Bacciocchi, Napoleon's sister, sent so visit him. But her courtesy was of short duration. The next day was Sunday, and the Pope might have hoped to be allowed to rest, but he had hardly slept a few hours when another messenger came with the order that he should leave at once. The cause of this sudden departure would seem to have been the dread which the Grand Duchess felt of incurring such a heavy responsibility as the custody of the Holy Father, especially when she had received from the Emperor no instructions on the subject, and she therefore hastened to transfer it to Prince Borghese, the husband of Pauline Bona-

⁵ Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I, p. 220.

parte and Governor-General of the departments beyond the Alps.

The Grand Duchess decided that the Pope should be sent to Turin by way of Genoa, and Cardinal Pacca by way of Bologna. The Holy Father was worn out by pain and fatigue, but he merely remarked to the Cardinal, "I perceive that these people wish to kill me with ill-treatment, and I foresee that I cannot long undergo such a life." In order to avoid any demonstration on the part of the inhabitants of Florence, the Pope was hurried away at four o'clock in the morning, without being allowed to hear Mass.

Travelling through a mountainous district by unfrequented roads, over some of which he was carried in a litter, the Holy Father reached Chiavari, on the Gulf of Genoa, on July 12, where he was under the jurisdiction of his former subject, Prince Borghese. The Prince, who was also without instructions from the Emperor, was as anxious as the Grand Duchess not to incur any responsibility by detaining the Pope, and resolved to send him to France as quickly and as secretly as possible. The officers charged with the execution of this plan thought it prudent to avoid passing through Genoa, and made the Holy Father embark at night near a villa called Castagna, and land at San Pier d'Arena, on the other side of Genoa, where a carriage awaited him to take him to Alessandria.⁶ Cardinal Pacca had already arrived there, but during the two days of repose granted to the Holy Father, both he and the Cardinal were closely guarded and were not allowed to see each other. Turin was avoided as carefully as Genoa, by making a long circuit through Mondovi, where the Holy Father was met by a large number of confraternities, and crowds accompanied him for several miles, to the great displeasure of General Boissard, the officer of gendarmes, then charged with his custody.

The Pope reached Grenoble on the evening of July 21, in the midst of enthusiastic demonstrations of affection on the part of the people, and was lodged in the prefect's palace. The prefect of the department, M. Fournier, a distinguished scientist and a good administrator, was then in Paris, and his authority was exercised in his absence by one of his councillors named Giraud, a secret agent of Fouché.⁷ The Holy Father was treated with respect, but still guarded like a prisoner, and though allowed to walk in the gardens of the prefecture, and give his blessings to the people, he was again

⁶ British Museum, Additional MSS. 8389. *Lettere e documenti relativi alla deportazione di Pio VII.* A description of the Holy Father's journey to Savona, by his Ajutante di Camara (valet de chambre) Giuseppe Moiraghi, one of those who were allowed to rejoin him at Radicofani.

⁷ St. de Mayol de Lupe. *Un Pape prisonnier, d'après des documents inédits* —In "Le Correspondant," vol. 138, January, 1885, p. 596.

separated from Cardinal Pacca and no communication was possible between them. Giraud, like the Grand Duchess and Prince Borghese, had received no orders with regard to the Pope; he considered himself, therefore, obliged to exercise a rigorous supervision over his prisoners, and though some laymen were admitted every day to assist at the Masses said by the Holy Father and Cardinal Pacca, no priest could visit them, and the Mayor of Grenoble was reprimanded for having allowed Cardinal Pacca to see a confessor.⁸

Napoleon was then at Schoenbrunn, near Vienna; when he learned, on July 18, that the Pope had been carried away from Rome, he wrote to Fouché that he was sorry that the Holy Father should have been arrested; that it was a great act of folly: "But there is no remedy for it; what is done is done." He ordered that, if the Pope were still near Genoa, or had entered France, he should be sent to Savona. He might even be sent back to Rome, "if his madness were to come to an end. But Cardinal Pacca was to be sent to the fortress of Fenestrelles and warned that if a single Frenchman were assassinated at his instigation, he should expiate it with his life."⁹ Fouché gave his orders in consequence, and on August 2, at two o'clock in the morning, Pius VII left Grenoble, and, still guarded by Colonel Boissard, travelled by Valence and Avignon to Nice. There he rested for three days, and thence, by a long circuit through the mountainous districts of Tenda, Mendovi and Cera, he reached Savona, where he was lodged in the bishop's palace on August 17. The journey of the Holy Father from Grenoble to Savona had been like a triumphal march; it had been a succession of enthusiastic popular demonstrations. At Avignon, which still looked on him as its lawful sovereign, the entire population had come forth to greet him; the town of Nice was illuminated every night during his stay, and the mountaineers of Tenda were ready to rescue him if he had expressed the wish.¹⁰

About an hour after Pius VII left Grenoble, Cardinal Pacca was brought away by an officer of gendarmes to the fortress of Fenestrelles, situated in the Alps which form the frontier between Piedmont and France; an intensely cold region, where the winter lasts several months. Napoleon, who knew his talents and his fidelity to Pius VII, had always feared and hated him, and looked on him as

⁸ While Cardinal Pacca was saying Mass, the freemasons of Grenoble held a meeting in the room above his, in order to admit into their society, or to promote, the envoy of Prince Borghese, Colonel Boissard, who had escorted the Holy Father from Chiavari to Grenoble.—Pacca, *Memorie*, t. II, pp. 58, 59.

⁹ Correspondance de Napoleon I., t. XIX, No. 1555. Au Comte Fouché. Schoenbrunn, 18 Juillet, 1809.

¹⁰ Louis Durante, *Histoire de Nice*. Turin, 1824, t. III, p. 365.

"an enemy of France who deserved no consideration."¹¹ The Cardinal was at first treated with great harshness. Though allowed to keep his servant and to assist at the Mass said by one of the priests then confined as State prisoners, he was not allowed to write a letter or to see a confessor. Once only by eluding the vigilance of the sentinel who watched his room, was he able to confess and to receive Holy Communion; but it was not until the following year (1810) that he could obtain leave to confess and to say Mass.¹² His imprisonment lasted three years and a half, until February 5, 1813, when he was allowed to rejoin Pius VII at Fontainebleau.

The prefect of the department of Montenotte, Count Chabrol de Volvic, was chiefly responsible for the care of the Holy Father at Savona, but the immediate supervision over him was entrusted to General César Berthier. A Piedmontese nobleman, Count de Salmatoris, was also specially sent from Turin to organize the Papal household on the same footing as that of a sovereign. Its expenses were to amount to 100,000 francs a month (\$20,000), and three carriages with the Imperial liveries were also to be provided. But Pius VII refused to accept the Emperor's gifts; he told his servants to take only what was necessary, and the carriages, which had been used only by General Berthier, were soon sent back to Turin. As a matter of fact, the furniture of the Pope's apartments was poor and insufficient; it had been lent to the bishop by the inhabitants of Savona; there were no carpets, the beds were wretched and insufficiently provided with coverings.¹³ A very close supervision was exercised over the Holy Father and all persons who came to visit him; his letters and those of his household were read by the prefect or by Prince Borghese. His confessor had been arrested in Rome and sent to Fenestrelles.¹⁴

General Miollis was instructed in the month of July to send all generals of religious orders to France, where they were to be lodged in small country towns; the Cardinals who had no diocese were to

¹¹ Correspondance de Napoleon I., t. XIX, No. 15,615. Au Comte Fouché. Schoenbrunn, 6 Aout, 1809.

¹² Pacca, *Memorie*, t. II, p. 142.

¹³ H. Chotard, *Le Pape Pie VII a Savone*. Paris, 1887, pp. 13, 24. M. Chotard's work is founded on a manuscript now in the Archives of France, containing the minutes of the letters written every day by General Berthier to Prince Borghese, and giving an account of the captivity of the Holy Father. The second part of his work, referring to the mission of von Lebzeltern to Pius VII., is derived from von Lebzeltern's inedited *Memoirs* in the possession of his daughter, which M. Chotard was allowed to study.

¹⁴ Leon Lecestre. *Letters inedites de Napoleon I.* [An viii, 1815.] Paris, 1897, No. 514. Au Comte Fouché. Schoenbrunn, 22 Aout, 1809. [These are letters which were not inserted in the official publication of the letters of Napoleon I., as not being calculated to do him credit.]

be sent to Paris. He does not, however, seem to have obeyed at once, for in December he received a peremptory order to send off within twenty-four hours all the Cardinals still in Rome, and the archives of the Vatican were also to be brought to France.¹⁵ Napoleon's idea of transferring the Holy See to Paris was gradually becoming more developed. In August he had asked Fouché's opinion on the subject: whether it might not be advisable to bring the Holy Father to Fontainebleau, and the French and Italian Cardinals to Paris.

"It would be an advantage to have the head of the Church in Paris, where he would cause no inconvenience. If he created some sensation, it would be as a novelty. . . . His fanaticism would gradually come to an end."¹⁶

Pius VII had refused to acknowledge any right on the part of the Emperor to nominate bishops to the French and Italian Churches until he had made reparation for the outrages he had committed against religion by the seizure of Rome, by the expulsion of the Sacred College and by his capture and deportation of the head of the Church.

Napoleon ordered Cardinals Fesch, Caprara and Maury, as well as the Bishops of Nantes and of Casale, to write to the Holy Father and to ask him in the name of the Minister of Worship to confirm the prelates recently named by the Emperor, and thereby avoid the danger of creating a schism in the Church. It would not be necessary to mention the Emperor's name in the Apostolic Bulls. In his reply to Cardinal Caprara the Pope remarked that, as the Minister of Worship, a dignitary not recognized by the Catholic Church, represented the Emperor, such a step would be equivalent to acknowledging the Emperor's right to make the nominations. He then enumerated the outrages which he and so many members of the clergy had suffered on the part of the Emperor, and he asked how could the author of these outrages be allowed to exercise the right which he claimed? Would not such a concession scandalize the faithful? Moreover, though he much desired to fill the vacant sees, how could he act in a matter of such importance without consulting his advisers, the members of the Sacred College, and all communication

¹⁵ *Lecestre*, No. 481. Au Comte Gaudin, Ministre des Finances. Schoenbrunn, 18th July, 1809.—No. 552. Au Comte Bigot de Priameneu, Ministre des Cultes. Trianon, 18 Decembre 1809.

¹⁶ *Lecestre*, No. 498. Au Comte Fouché, Ministre de la Police generale. Schoenbrunn, 6 Aout 1809.

with them had been stopped? He had even been refused the help of a secretary.¹⁷

In November, 1809, the Emperor assembled a committee of bishops, whose opinions with regard to the questions pending between him and the Pope might, he hoped, give an appearance of legality to his acts. It was composed of Cardinal Fesch, the president; Cardinal de Maury; de Barral, Bishop of Tours; Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes; Bourlier, Bishop of Evreux; Mannay, Bishop of Trèves; Canaveri, Bishop of Vercellis; the Abbé Emery, Superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and Père Fontana, the General of the Barnabite Order.¹⁸ Three series of questions were laid before the Ecclesiastical Committee. The first related to matters which interested Christian society in general; the second to what specially concerned France, and the third to the affairs of the Churches of Italy and Germany, and to the Bull of Excommunication. The council returned its answers to these questions and closed its proceedings on January 11, 1810. In the preamble of its report it courageously expressed the sympathy and the affection it felt for the Holy Father in the painful situation in which he was placed. It expressed the hope that the Emperor would hasten to "bring about a much desired reconciliation between the Holy Father and himself, by the complete liberty of the Pope, surrounded by his proper advisers, without whom he cannot communicate with the Church entrusted to his care or solve any great question or provide for the wants of Catholicity."¹⁹

The council was very cautious in its replies, as it feared to irritate Napoleon and drive him to a complete rupture with the Holy See, but even Talleyrand, who has given an epitome of its transactions, and in whom one could hardly have expected to find a defender of the Holy Father, regrets that it should not have made greater efforts to convince the Emperor that before making any accusations against the Pope, he should grant him as much liberty as he himself should consider requisite for the issue of Bulls,²⁰ and ask him, therefore, what he would consider indispensable for that purpose.

One of the Emperor's questions related to the convocation of a

¹⁷ Pacca, *Memorie*, t. III, p. 22. Brief to Cardinal Caprara. 25th August, 1809.

¹⁸ M. Emery, who probably saw that Napoleon intended to make use of this Ecclesiastical Council as a mask to conceal his despotic aims, rarely assisted at its meetings and refused to sign its replies. Padre Fontana resisted only at its first meetings; and having, shortly after, incurred the imperial displeasure, he was imprisoned in Vincennes from 1811 until 1814.

¹⁹ *Memoires du Prince de Talleyrand*, publiés par le Duc de Broglie. Paris, 1891, t. II, p. 52.

²⁰ *Memoires de Talleyrand*, t. II, p. 72.

council on the pretext that the affairs of the Church are examined and managed in Rome by only a small number of theologians. The reply was that a general council could not be held without the Head of the Church, as otherwise it would not represent the universal Church, and that the authority of a national council would not suffice for the regulation of matters which interested the whole Catholic world. In replying to other questions they agreed, however, with the Emperor that the Consistory should be composed of prelates chosen from among all the Catholic nations, and that he united in his person all the rights with regard to the nomination of Cardinals which had been possessed by the sovereigns of the States which he had added to his Empire. The council was also of opinion that the Pope could not complain of any essential infraction of the Concordat; for, as to the *Articles Organiques*, many of them were only applications or consequences of maxims accepted in the Gallican Church, others might be considered as only temporary, and it was to be hoped that they should be soon revoked or modified.²¹

In reply to the question whether the state of the clergy had been improved by the Concordat or not, the council enumerated with much eloquence the benefits which had been conferred on the Church. Chapters had been endowed, scholarships had been founded for the seminaries, students presented by their bishops were exempted from conscription, the religious orders employed in gratuitous teaching and the assistance of the poor and infirm had been re-established. But the most difficult question to answer was, If the French government has not infringed the Concordat, can the Pope arbitrarily refuse to confirm the archbishops and bishops who have been named, and thus ruin religion in France? The council maintained that the Pope was bound by the Concordat, and it proceeded to examine the motives which the Holy Father had given for his refusal, in his letter to Cardinal Caprara. It maintained that the innovations of which he complained had been beneficial to religion, and would not acknowledge the invasion of Rome could be a motive for refusing to grant canonical institution to the bishops who had been named, although the Holy Father had only spiritual arms for the defence of his State. With regard to the third motive given by the Holy Father, namely, that he had been separated by violence from his proper advisers, and deprived of all free communication with them, the council was obliged to reply that it could only place it

²¹ *Memoires de Talleyrand*, t. II, p. 50. Three of the articles indicated by the Council; that which related to the authorization by the Government of briefs from the *Penitenzieria*; to the income which a priest required to possess before being ordained; and to the termination of the powers of vicars-general, were revoked by a decree of February 28, 1810.

under the eyes of his Majesty, who would perceive how just and strong it was.

To the question as to what ought to be done for the good of religion if the Pope refuses to execute the Concordat and the Emperor considers it as abrogated, the council suggested that it might be looked upon as suspended. It then recapitulated the various modes of nominating bishops which had existed in France down to the Concordat of 1516 between Leo X and Francis I, by which the nomination of bishops was granted to the King and the confirmation or institution was reserved to the Pope. But these modifications in the mode of election required to be approved by the Church, and one of the chief defects of the *Constitution Civile du Clergé* was that the *Assemblée Constituante* was incompetent to re-establish rules of discipline which had been abolished by the Church. The council thought, therefore, that the wisest course to follow would be to convoke a national council, which should examine the question. Napoleon was not pleased with the answer, as he thought that the Gallican Church had the power to establish the ancient usages abolished by the Concordat of 1801, but the council persisted in its opinion that a national council could alone solve the difficulty. It would either draw up provisional disciplinary regulations on the subject, if it considered itself competent to do so, after remonstrating respectfully with the Pope, and finding that its prayers were not listened to, or, if it thought itself incompetent, it would appeal to a general council. If that were impossible, the national council might declare that the canonical institution given by the metropolitan to his suffragans, or by the senior bishop of the province to the metropolitan, should take the place of the Papal Bulls.

Talleyrand, in his commentary on the proceedings of the council, remarks that it seemed to believe that the faults were all on the side of the Pope; he asks was it from a desire to please or from pusillanimity, and he blames it for not insisting every day on the necessity of setting the Pope free before thinking of a council.

To the question of what the Emperor as "Suzerain of Germany, heir of Charlemagne, true Emperor of the West, and Eldest Son of the Church," ought to do to re-establish religion in Germany, where the churches complained of having been abandoned by the Pope, the council could only reply by expressing vague hopes that Napoleon, as Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, might come to some agreement with the Sovereign Pontiff, and provide a remedy for these evils. Here Talleyrand draws attention to the dishonesty and bad faith manifested by Napoleon in attributing the religious troubles of Germany to neglect on the part of the Holy Father, and he

observes that with regard to this point the reasoning of the council was very feeble and insignificant.²²

In the last question Napoleon denounced the Bull of Excommunication as being "contrary to Christian charity, as well as to the honor and independence of the throne," and he asked "what steps should be taken in times of trouble and calamity to prevent the Popes from thus abusing their power." The council replied that no one was named in the Bull; that the French bishops had refused to admit and to publish the Bulls issued by Boniface VIII against Philippe-le-Bel, by Julius II against Louis XII, and by Sixtus V against Henry IV. It also expressed an opinion that if the Bull of June 10, 1809, had been addressed to the bishops of France, they would have declared it to be "contrary to the discipline of the Gallican Church, and to the authority of the sovereign," and there was no doubt that if a national council were assembled, it would appeal against it to a general council.²³

Napoleon thus brought to end by a decisive measure all further discussion with regard to the independence of the Sovereign Pontiff. The Papal States had, it is true, been already annexed by the Imperial decree of June 10, 1809,²⁴ but the Emperor considered that a *Senatus-consulte*, a law enacted by the Senate, would impart greater solemnity to the fact. A report drawn up by M. de Champagny, Minister of Foreign Affairs, was therefore presented to the Senate. It recapitulated all the false and absurd accusations of harboring brigands and conspiring with the enemies of France, which Napoleon, since the coronation, had so often flung against the Court of Rome.²⁵ It asserted that, in spite of the benevolence and the moderation of the Emperor, the ungrateful Papal Government had at last fallen a victim to the disorder and anarchy of which it had been the cause. "The Imperial eagles had again taken possession of their ancient territory; the dominion of Charlemagne had

²² Talleyrand, *Memoires*, t. II, p. 69. "La raison du Concile sur ce point est bien faible et bien insignifiant."

²³ Talleyrand, *Memoires*, t. II, p. 70.—Cardinal Pacca calls this answer a humiliating proof of the great influence which the spirit of flattery and of excessive ambition can exercise even over persons distinguished by their high rank and great learning. Pacca, *Memorie*, t. III, p. 34.

²⁴ See the July number of the *REVIEW*.

²⁵ Even Napoleon thought that his Minister's report was unfair, and he wished that the Pope should be treated with, at least, some semblance of justice. In a note to de Champagny, he told him that the collection of documents added to his report was incomplete; that besides the notes of Alquier, those of the Pope's ministers and of the Legate should be added to it. Otherwise the public would not be able to judge, and doubt would prevail instead of conviction. He requested him also to moderate the tone of his language.—*Correspondance* de Napoleon, t. XX, No. 16,244. A. M. de Champagny. Paris, 6 Fevrier, 1810.

again come into the hands of a worthier heir," and the Senate was asked to decide as to its future destinies. The Senate therefore decreed that the State of Rome divided into the departments of Rome and of the Trasimene, should thenceforth form part of the French Empire; that the City of Rome should be the second city of the Empire, that the Prince Imperial should bear the title of King of Rome,²⁶ and that the Emperors, after being crowned in Paris, should be crowned in Rome, in St. Peter's before the tenth year of their reign. It also enacted that the Popes on their election should take an oath never to do anything contrary to the four propositions of the Gallican Church accepted by the assembly of the Clergy in 1682, and that the same propositions were to be common to all the Catholic Churches of the Empire. Finally it decreed that the Pope should have a palace in Paris and another in Rome; that he should enjoy a revenue of 2,000,000 of francs (\$400,000) from land situated in different parts of the Empire and that the expenses of the Sacred College and of the Propaganda should be paid by the imperial treasury.²⁷

Napoleon had already begun to make preparations for the establishment of the Sovereign Pontiff in Paris and to make of that city the seat of the government of the Church. Millions were being spent on enlarging and embellishing the Archbishop's palace, to adapt it for the reception of the Holy Father.²⁸ Orders were given to bring to Paris all the archives of the Vatican, of the *Dataria* and of the *Penitenzieria*, at the rate of one hundred carloads a week, as well as the Pope's tiara and the other pontifical ornaments.²⁹

Nevertheless, the inflexible resistance of the Holy Father, who, though isolated and guarded as though in a prison, refused to yield to the imperial demands, caused the Emperor much embarrassment. Accustomed to be surrounded by servile flatterers, and to overcome all opposition by brute force, he could not understand how a feeble old man, deprived of all wordly assistance, could still persist in asserting his independence and in maintaining the rights of the Holy

²⁶ It was only on February 6, 1810, that Napoleon, after declaring the nullity of his marriage with Josephine, had decided on marrying an Austrian instead of a Russian princess.—Correspondance, t. XX, No. 16,211. A M. de Champagny. Paris, 6 Fevrier, 1810.

²⁷ Correspondance de Napoleon, t. XX, No. 16,263. Expose des motifs du Senatus-Consulte sur la reunion des Etats de Rome a l'Empire. Paris, 17 Fevrier, 1810.—No. 16,264. Senatus-Consulte. Palais des Tuileries, 17 Fevrier, 1810.

²⁸ Memoires documents et ecrits divers laisses par le Prince de Metternich. Paris, 1880, t. II, p. 341.

²⁹ Correspondance de Napoleon I., t. XX, No. 16,196. Au Comte Bigot de Preameneu. Paris, 2 Fevrier 1810.

See. The Emperor's marriage with the Archduchess Maria Louisa seemed, at last, to present a solution of the difficulty, for it gave the Emperor of Austria the opportunity of acting as intermediary between the Holy Father and Napoleon, who seemed well pleased to accept his offer.

The Chevalier von Lebzeltern, councillor of the Austrian Embassy in Paris, was, therefore, sent to Savona in May, 1810, ostensibly for the purpose of discussing with the Holy Father some questions relating to the Ecclesiastical affairs of Austria, but he was also instructed to seek the means of bringing about a reconciliation between the Holy Father and the Emperor.³⁰ He carried an unofficial document containing a summary of the Emperor's views. It showed no intention on his part of making the slightest concession to the Holy Father, with the exception that he would allow him to reside at Avignon, instead of at Paris, but he could not be permitted to return to Rome, unless he renounced his temporal sovereignty, and "sincerely recognized the union of Rome to the Empire." The Emperor remarked in a rather contemptuous manner that he did not seek the Pope, and that he could do without him; for the bishops could grant dispensations; the chapters could name capitular vicars who could govern the Sees, and if the Pope persisted in refusing to give canonical institution to the bishops, a council could be convoked which would bestow it.

The general tone of this paper was not conciliatory; some portions of it were even insulting; but Prince Metternich warned his envoy, that, in his opinion, much of the hostility which it expressed was merely intended to provide matter for a negotiation; and he did not think it impossible to re-establish the Papal See in the Eternal city, if the Pope were able to accept some modification of his temporal sovereignty.³¹

After encountering much opposition from General César Berthier, M. von Lebzeltern had, on May 15th, his first interview with the Holy Father, who had known him in Rome, and who was deeply touched by this proof of friendship on the part of the Emperor of Austria. In this audience and in those which followed on the 15th and the 20th of May, von Lebzeltern sought to impress on the Pope the necessity of extricating himself from the painful position in which he was placed. At one time, even, the Holy Father seemed inclined to think that, provided he were allowed to have the assistance of the Sacred College, and freedom of intercourse with the faithful,

³⁰ Metternich, *Memoires*, etc., t. II, p. 335.

³¹ Metternich, *Memoires*, etc., t. II, p. 336. *Instructions pour M. le Chevalier de Lebzeltern.* Paris, le 6 Mai, 1810.

he might be able to reside in Rome. He could not, indeed, oblige the Emperor to restore what he had taken, but he could protect against the usurpation of his States and he would refuse to accept any pension from France. In any case, he would never consent to abandon Rome, and accept Avignon in exchange.³² To a suggestion of von Lebzeltern's that it would be advisable to withdraw the Bull of Excommunication, the Holy Father replied that such an act would be a betrayal of his duty and would expose him to be accused of weakness. Napoleon should first, by some act in favor of religion, show a sincere desire to be reconciled to the Church. The Holy Father, however, who mistrusted himself, and feared to be led into making too many concessions, refused to come to any decision, unless he were supported by the opinions of his advisers the Cardinals. He even feared that, in his friendly conversations with von Lebzeltern, he might have shown himself inclined to concede too much, and in his last interview with the envoy of Prince Metternich, he authorized him to publish, on his return to Paris, only the following statements: That he had found the Holy Father fully resigned to decrees of Divine Providence in whose hands he had humbly placed the defence of his cause. That he felt calm in his prison, and that he was convinced that the disorders which menaced the Church would be imputed to their true author. The Holy Father ardently desired that the Empress should be reconciled with the Church; that he should cease to persecute her, and allow him to perform the duties of his ministry and to communicate freely with the faithful. He also wished it to be known that he was most anxious for a reconciliation, but not against his conscience (*aux dépens de son conscience*) that he felt no animosity or rancor against Napoleon, but that he forgave all the past.³³

The only result, therefore, of von Lebzeltern's mission to Pius VII was that it enabled the Holy Father to express once more his refusal to renounce his temporal rights and to demand that he should not be deprived of the present of the Cardinals whose assistance he required to be able to carry on the administration of the Church. But, far from allowing the members of the Sacred College to rejoin the pope, Napoleon, just then, banished a certain number of them to various provincial towns where they were subjected to a strict supervision, and thereby hindered all communication between them and the Holy Father. This arbitrary measure was the result of the indignation which he felt at their absence from the celebration of his marriage with the Archduchess Maria Louisa, of Austria; for they

³² Chotard, *Le Pape Pie VII a Savone*, pp. 93, 97.

³³ Chotard, p. 124.

refused to sanction it by their presence, as they considered that the tribunal which had declared the Emperor's first marriage to be null, was not competent to decide the question.

The circumstances under which the religious marriage between Napoleon and the Empress Josephine took place on December 1st, 1804, the eve of his coronation, have been described in the number of the "Review" for April, 1909. Since that time, all the Emperor's undertakings had prospered, in every campaign victory had followed victory, and every continental power lay prostrate at his feet; but the triumphs were embittered by the fact that he had no heir to perpetuate his dynasty and to rule the colossal Empire which he had founded. The idea, therefore, of establishing the nullity of his marriage and of contracting an alliance with one of the reigning houses of Europe, which should consolidate his throne, had long been considered by the Emperor, and vague rumors on the subject had even been circulating among the people long before the publication of any official announcement.³⁴ It was only at the end of November, 1809, that Napoleon revealed his intention to Josephine, when he expressed to her the grief he felt at being obliged for the sake of the welfare of the Empire, to come to such a decision, and entreated her to consent to a divorce. The civil marriage contracted in 1796 was formally dissolved at a meeting of all the members of the imperial family held at the Tuileries on December 15th, when Napoleon and Josephine declared that for the good of France and the interests of the dynasty, they were ready to make the sacrifice of their own feelings and separate by mutual consent. On the following day a decree of the Senate confirmed this declaration and pronounced the dissolution of the marriage.³⁵

It was necessary, however, before the Emperor could be free to contract a new marriage, that the Church should pronounce the nullity of that which had been privately celebrated in 1804. Napoleon had at first intended to marry a Prussian princess, the Grand Duchess Anne, the sister of Alexander I; and, at the interview at Erfurth, on October, 1808, that sovereign had expressed his willingness to obtain his mother's assent. Alexander hesitated, however,

³⁴ A document in the French Archives, drawn up in 1807, shows that Napoleon was then already resolved to annul his marriage. It is a list of eight Catholic and ten Protestant princesses, of the reigning families of Europe, from among whom he could select a wife.—H. Welschinger, *Le Divorce de Napoleon*, Paris, 1889, p. 270.

³⁵ This mode of divorce was sanctioned by the *Code Napoleon*, but not when the parties had been married for ten years; and there could not be a remarriage until three years had elapsed. Divorce was also forbidden to all the members of the Imperial family. Napoleon, thus, set aside the regulations of his own code.—Welschinger, p. 63.

to come to a decision; he hoped to secure previously the ratification of an agreement which he had made with France relative to Poland.³⁶ While he thus delayed to give a definite answer, the Emperor of Austria and his ministers, anxious to acquire a guarantee of a lasting peace and a political alliance which should save their country from the ruin and dismemberment which would be the consequence of another war, gave Napoleon to understand that if he sought to marry an Austrian princess, his demand would not be rejected. The Empress Josephine had already spoken to him on the subject, shortly after the divorce, as she informed Madame de Metternich, the wife of the Austrian minister; assuring her at the same time, that otherwise the fall of Austria was certain, and that it was also, perhaps, the only way to prevent Napoleon from creating a schism.³⁷ A council, formed of the principal dignitaries of the Empire, convoked by Napoleon on January 21, 1810, gave its opinion in favor of an Austrian marriage; the Austrian Ambassador, Prince von Schwarzenberg, transmitted the Emperor's demand to his Court which consented at once, and on March 8th, the formal request for the hand of the Archduchess was made at Vienna by Marshal Berthier, Prince of Neufchatel, Napoleon's special envoy.

From the beginning of the negotiations, the Austrian Ambassador had been instructed to declare that the Emperor Francis would refuse to consent to his daughter's marriage unless the nullity of the religious marriage between Napoleon and the Empress Josephine had first been acknowledged by the Church.³⁸ The objection had, indeed, been already foreseen, and Napoleon, in his uncertainty as to the steps to be taken, had consulted Cambacérès on the subject. The matrimonial causes of sovereigns had always been reserved to the Pope, but, at that moment, Pius VII was his prisoner at Savona, and had, moreover, excommunicated him, and could not, therefore, be requested to act as judge. Cambacérès suggested that the matter should be submitted to the Diocesan officiality, or ecclesiastical tribunal of Paris, which, a few years previously, had annulled the marriage of Jerome Bonaparte with Miss Patterson; and, on December 22nd, he sent for the clergymen who composed the Diocesan and

³⁶ L. S. Thiers, *History of the Consulate and the Empire*. London, 1894, t. VI, p. 58; t. VII, p. 55.

³⁷ Metternich, *Memoires*, t. II, p. 314. *La Comtesse de Metternich a son mari*. Paris, le 3 Janvier 1810.

³⁸ Metternich wrote to Prince Schwarzenberg, the Austrian Ambassador in Paris, that "his Majesty would never give his consent to a marriage which should not be in conformity with the precepts of our religion." Welschinger, pp. 77, 81, 84.

Metropolitan Officialities,³⁹ to inform them that it was the Emperor's intention to have his marriage with the Empress Josephine declared null on the ground of the absence of the parish priest and of witnesses. The officials, alarmed at the heavy responsibility laid upon them, pleaded that they were not competent to judge a cause, which, according to ancient usage, had always been reserved to the Pope. Cambacérès replied that he had not been instructed to apply to the pope, and that, under the circumstances; it was impossible to do so, but the officials refused to judge the matter unless the committee of Cardinals and Bishops named by the Emperor, for his guidance in ecclesiastical questions,⁴⁰ decided they were competent, and the interview ended without any concession being made on either side. A week later, Cambacérès, being again requested by the officiality to consult the committee, brought forward another cause of nullity, namely, the want of consent on the part of the Emperor; but the officials still refused to act until authorized by the committee. The decision of the prelates, who, in the meanwhile, had been appealed to by Cambacérès, was given on January 3rd. It stated that if the want of consent were legally proved before a competent tribunal, the marriage of the Emperor and Empress would be null: that the cause was within the competence of the diocesan officiality; and that an appeal should be made from its decision to the metropolitan officiality, and from thence to the officiality of the primatial See of Lyons.⁴¹ It was not, therefore, with regard to the point first mentioned by Cambacérès that the committee gave its opinion, but with regard to his second suggestion which probably seemed more likely to furnish a motive for a sentence of nullity.

The witnesses presented on behalf of the Emperor were Marshals Duroc and Berthier, Prince de Talleyrand and Cardinal Fesch. The three first, on being questioned by the official, deposed that the Emperor had often declared in their presence, that he had not intended to bind himself irrevocably, and that he did not consider himself bound by a marriage that had not been accompanied by the necessary formalities. Cardinal Fesch, who had performed the ceremony, related the circumstances under which it had taken place. The Emperor, he said, had sent for him on the even of the corona-

³⁹ *Diocesan Officiality*.—Abbe Rudemare, promotor: Abbe Boileve, official.—*Metropolitan officiality*.—Abbe Corpet, promotor: Abbe Lejeas, official.—Geoffroy de Grandmaison, *Napoleon et les Cardinaux noirs*. Paris, 1895, p. 13.

⁴⁰ See the April number of the *REVIEW*, p. 250.

⁴¹ Welschinger, p. 95.—The Abbe Rudemare's pamphlet, "Relation of the proceedings which took place on the occasion of the demand for the nullity of the marriage between Napoleon Bonaparte and Josephine Tascher de la Pagerie" is given in full in Michaud's *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, 1858, t. 21, p. 57, in the life of Josephine.

tion and informed him that the Empress insisted on receiving the nuptial benediction; that he had consented in order to calm her, but that he would have no witnesses. The Cardinal objected that without witnesses there would be no marriage; but, finding it impossible to overcome his resistance, he went to the Holy Father, and told him that he would often require to have recourse to him for dispensations, and that he begged of him to grant him all those which should be sometimes necessary for the performance of his duties as Grand-almoner. The pope consented, and the Cardinal immediately celebrated the marriage at about four o'clock in the afternoon. He was very much surprised a few days later, when the Emperor, finding that he had given the Empress a certificate of her marriage, reprimanded him severely and revealed to him that the sole object of what he had done was to tranquilize the Empress and to yield to circumstances.

Cardinal Fesch had made the same declaration to the prelates of the Ecclesiastical Committee on December 26th, in somewhat different terms, and it is probably on it, that they based their reply to the officiality. After relating his interview with the Emperor, he said that he went to the pope, and, without revealing to him the situation in which he was placed, he told him that, as Grand-almoner, he was or might sometimes be in very embarrassing circumstances, without being able to have recourse to the authority of the Archbishop of Paris, because he should be obliged to mention to him facts of the utmost importance which ought to remain concealed, as well as for other strong and urgent reasons. The pope had then replied: "I give you all the powers that I can give," and the Cardinal had thought that he was sufficiently authorized to celebrate the marriage without witnesses or the previous publication of banns. He also mentioned Napoleon's anger on finding that he had given the Empress a marriage certificate, and his assertion that he had not given, and could not have given a real consent to his marriage, but that, being obliged to avoid quarrelling with the Empress in such an important conjuncture, he had insisted that the marriage should be celebrated without witnesses or publication of banns. The Council then decided that the want of formalities was sufficiently covered by the Pope's dispensation, and that the want of consent would suffice as a cause of nullity.⁴²

⁴² Minutes of the Ecclesiastical Commission quoted in "Le Correspondant." Paris, September, 1856, vol. 38, p. 958.—A special meeting of the Commission was held on December 26, 1809, at which Cambaceres stated that he was charged by the Emperor to consult the bishops as to the procedure to be followed, and the causes of nullity to be found in his marriage. He then read to the bishops a minute of the request that they should present to the officiality of Paris, and left it for their discussion. Cardinal Fesch was then heard.

It was, however, on the absence of witnesses and of the parish-priest that the diocesan promotor, Abbé Budemare, founded his decision against the validity of the marriage. Making a very subtle distinction, he asserted, that as Cardinal Fesch had only asked the Pope for the dispensations which he might sometimes find necessary for the fulfillment of his duties as Grand-almoner, and as he had not particularly specified and named the extraordinary and parochial functions which he was about to perform, he could not have received the dispensation for the two witnesses, nor the power to take the place of the parish-priest. On receiving this opinion, the diocesan official, Abbé Boileve, pronounced his sentence. He declared the marriage between the Emperor and Empress to be null, but he acknowledged at the same time, that it was difficult "to have recourse to the visible head of the Church to whom it had always belonged, *de facto*, to take cognizance of these extraordinary cases and to decide on them"; and that the prelates had declared that the cause was of the competency of his tribunal.⁴³ The Abbé Budemare appealed from the sentence to the metropolitan officiality, on the ground that the official, contrary to the usual practice, had not ordered the parties to rehabilitate their marriage. The metropolitan promoter, Abbé Coppet, accepted the opinion that the dispensation granted to Cardinal Fesch was insufficient, but refused to discuss the plea of want of consent on the part of the Emperor. The metropolitan official, Abbé Lejeas, on the other hand, accepted both causes of nullity, and pronounced the final decision, for no appeal was made to the primatial officiality of Lyons.⁴⁴

The sentences of the officialities were sent to Count Otto, the French Ambassador at Vienna, who kept them a few days and then, as they were not asked for, sent them back to Paris.⁴⁵ Count Sigismund von Hohenwart, Archbishop of Vienna, then raised unexpected difficulties. Before celebrating by proxy the marriage of the Archduchess, he demanded the fullest details about the civil marriage of General Bonaparte and Josephine; among others, for what

⁴³ Abbe Rudemare's "Relation."—Welschinger, p. 120.

⁴⁴ Welschinger, p. 129.—Pere G. Desjardins, S. J., in a review of M. Welschinger's work in the "*Etudes religieuses, philosophiques, historiques et littéraires*" for June, 1889, p. 315, is of opinion that the Metropolitan officiality gave its decision rather hastily, and without sufficient proofs. As to the main point, however (*le fond de l'affaire*), he does not wish to maintain like M. Welschinger, that the sentence was erroneous. Pius VII, and the thirteen Cardinals who refused to assist at the second marriage, did not declare against the sentence, but only against the competence of the two officialities. The Holy Father alone was competent to decide the question, and they would not sanction by their presence the usurpation of which the officialities were guilty.

⁴⁵ J. A. von Helfert, Maria Louise Erzherzogin von Oesterreich, Kaiserin der Franzosen. Wien, 1873, p. 98.

motive it had been dissolved and by what judges? If it had been renewed before the Coronation; if it had been declared null by the ecclesiastical tribunal; if the rules prescribed by the Bull of Benedict XIV. had been observed in pronouncing judgment? Otto assured the Archbishop that the marriage had been annulled by the two officialities of Paris, but he still maintained that he had no legal and certain proof of the fact. At last, on March 1st, Otto gave Count Metternich an attestation that he had had in his hands the sentence of the officialities which were founded on the want of the formalities prescribed by the laws of the Church, and that the seven prelates who had signed these sentences had acknowledged the nullity of the Emperor Napoleon's first marriage. The Minister then sent an extract from his attestation to the Archbishop who made no further opposition,⁴⁶ and the marriage by proxy, at which Napoleon was represented by the Archduke Charles, was celebrated on March 11th.

There were at that time in Paris twenty-nine Cardinals including Cardinal Caprara, the former Nuncio, who was on his death-bed, and Cardinal Fesch, who, as Grand-almoner, was to officiate at the Imperial marriage. The others were not agreed as to the propriety of assisting at the ceremony. Invitations had been sent to them to be present at the Court on four occasions: the presentation to the Emperor and Empress of the great dignitaries of the State at Saint Cloud; the civil marriage; the religious marriage in Paris; and the reception at the Tuileries by the Sovereigns on their throne, of the Senate, the *Corps Législatif*, and the great personages of the Empire. On discussing the matter, thirteen Cardinals declared that though they were willing to assist at the two receptions, as it would be merely an act of courtesy, they could not be present on the civil marriage, as they would thereby seem not to approve an innovation which has been condemned by the Church; nor at the religious marriage, as they could not accept the sentence of nullity pronounced by the officialities of Paris which were incompetent to judge a cause reserved to the Sovereign Pontiff.⁴⁷ The fourteen others did not consider themselves bound to follow their example, but all the efforts of Cardinal Fesch to persuade them to change their resolution and the fury of the Emperor, who, when informed of it, exclaimed, "they will not dare!" could not conquer their resistance.

At the first reception the Emperor showed the Cardinals much courtesy; he presented each of them to the Empress, and pointed

⁴⁶ Helfert, p. 102.—Welschinger, p. 98.

⁴⁷ *Memoires du Cardinal Consalvi, avec une Introduction et des Notes, par J. Cretineau-Joby.* Paris, 1864, t. I, p. 420. These thirteen Cardinals were: Mattei, Pignatelli, della Somaglia, di Pietro, Litta, Saluzzo, Ruffo-Scilla, Brancadoro, Jaleffi, Scotti, Gabrielli, Opizzoni and Consalvi.

out especially Consalvi, "the Cardinal who negotiated the Concordat"; for he hoped by this affability to induce them to yield. But the thirteen Cardinals were faithful to the decision they had taken, and on Monday, April 2nd, they did not appear at the Tuileries; where, besides Cardinal Fesch, who celebrated the Mass, only eleven of the fourteen were present, for Cardinals Ershine, Dugnani and Desping were kept away by illness. It was the moment when Napoleon's power and glory had attained their culminating point. By a series of unparalleled victories, he had crushed all his enemies on the continent, and the House of Austria had considered it an honor to contract an alliance with him; but, when surrounded by the great officers of his household and a brilliant court of Kings and princes, he entered the large hall of the Louvre where the altar had been raised, he looked at once at the places reserved for the Cardinals and perceived that the thirteen were absent. It was the most severe blow that his pride could have received, for he felt that their refusal to assist at his marriage was a protest against the sentence of the officiality of Paris, and that it would be employed to throw doubts on the legitimacy of his heir. His eyes flashed, his countenance took an expression of anger and ferocity which terrified those who saw it. This fury was so great that immediately after the ceremony, he gave orders to shoot Cardinals Opizzoni, Consalvi, and a third, whose name is not known, probably Litta or di Pietro. On second thoughts, he named Consalvi alone, and the Cardinal believed that it was owing to the intervention of Fouché that the sentence was not carried out.⁴⁸ The reception of the following day was the occasion chosen by Napoleon to wreak his vengeance on the Cardinals. Along with the Senators, the Legislative body, the Ministers and the Councillors of State, the members of the Sacred College were made to wait for three hours in the ante-chambers of the Tuileries. When the reception began, an aide-de-camp coming from the room, announced that the Emperor would not receive the Cardinals who had not assisted at the marriage, and that they should leave at once. They obeyed, and as they could not find their carriages, they were obliged to return to their homes on foot.

On the following Wednesday, the Minister of Worship, Bigot de Prédenne, sent for the thirteen Cardinals and informed them that they had been guilty of high treason; that they had conspired against the Emperor, by plotting to cast a doubt on the legitimacy of the heir to his throne; that all their property, ecclesiastical and patrimonial, should be sequestered; that the Emperor refused to consider them any longer as Cardinals and forbade them to wear the

⁴⁸ Consalvi, *Memoires*, t. I, p. 437; t. II, p. 205.

insignia of their rank. He even gave them to understand that some of them might be prosecuted. The Cardinals easily proved that they had not conspired, but had acted openly and with the full knowledge of Cardinal Fesch, and the Minister allowed them to send a letter to the Emperor to explain their conduct and to assure him that the sole motive for it was that the pope had not been consulted. But Napoleon had left Paris and his orders were executed rigorously. The thirteen Cardinals were thenceforth obliged to dress in black; they were known as *les Cardinaux noirs* (the black Cardinals); and were forced to depend for their subsistence on the charity of the French Catholics. Two months later, on July 10th, they were banished from Paris, and sent to live, two by two, in towns on the eastern frontiers. To increase the discomfort of their exile, those who had least frequented each other's society while in Paris, and were less intimate, were sent to the same towns.⁴⁹

In the meanwhile there had been no relaxation in the persecution of the Church. The Minister of Worship, M. Bigot de Préameneu, had been ordered in April to draw up a plan of the measures to be taken with regard to the affairs of the clergy in Italy; regulating everything "as if the pope did not exist"; and these measures were to be carried out by successive decrees, according as it was thought necessary. The religious orders were to be suppressed and their members pensioned; the Bishops, the Canons and the Parochial clergy were to be obliged to take an oath of obedience to the Government; and the number of bishoprics and of the parishes was to be reduced by uniting several together. Later on, Napoleon ordered that in the departments of Rome and of the Trasimene, which represented the last provinces taken from the pope, no priest was to be ordained without his permission; the bishops, canons and priests who refused to take the oath were to be sent to France, and with regard to the bishops, "not only their ecclesiastical property, but that which they had inherited," was to be seized. The number of bishoprics in these two departments would thus be ultimately reduced from thirty-two to five, and twenty parishes would be thought quite enough for Rome instead of eighty. The measures were to be represented, "even by articles in Roman newspapers," as merely the consequences of the rebellion of the clergy; "the rebellion of the bishops would furnish the Church with another grievance against the pope." In

⁴⁹ Consalvi, *Memoires*, t. I, p. 450; t. II, p. 215.—Cardinals Consalvi and Brancadoro were sent to Reims; Mattei and Pignatelli to Bethel; della Somaglia and Scotti to Mezieres; Saluzzo and Galeffi to Charleville; Litta and Ruffo-Scilla to Saint Quentin; di Pietro to Semur; Gabrielli to Montbard, and Opizzoni to Saulieu; but the two last were soon sent to live with Cardinal di Pietro.

the rest of Italy, too, the property of the bishoprics, for which the Holy Father should refuse to grant canonical institution, would be confiscated; and, there again, it could be shown that "the obstinacy of the pope would cause the Church an irreparable misfortune."⁵⁰

But Pius VII still refused to grant canonical institution to the bishops nominated by the Emperor, unless he were allowed to have the assistance of his advisers, the Cardinals. Napoleon then made another effort to overcome his resistance by sending to him Cardinal Spina, Archbishop of Genoa, and Cardinal Caselli, Archbishop of Parma, two prelates on whose conformity with his views he could reckon, and they arrived at Savona on July 5th; not, as though charged with opening a negotiation, but, apparently, while on their way to their respective dioceses. The pope, however, mistrusted them; for Cardinal Caselli had accepted a place as Senator without asking his authorization, and he showed much coldness and reserve in the few interviews he granted them. All that M. de Chabrol could learn from them was that the Holy Father again expressed his desire before entering on any negotiation, to have around him some Cardinals chosen by himself; that he declared that he would not leave Savona except to return to Rome; and that as to the nomination of bishops, he did not wish to act without consulting experienced persons on whom he could closely rely.⁵¹ The Cardinals, therefore, left Savona without obtaining any concession, and Napoleon was obliged to seek some other means of executing his plans. By a decree, dated February 28, 1810, he had revoked one of the *Articles Organiques* added to the Concordat in 1801,⁵² which prescribed that after the death of a bishop, his Vicars-general should continue to administer the diocese while it remained vacant; and he enacted that, thenceforth, in similar cases, the diocese should be governed by the Vicars elected by the Chapter. This was merely the re-establishment of the rules laid down by the Council of Trent, but Napoleon made use of this concession to enable the bishops whom he had nominated, to administer their dioceses without being confirmed, by persuading the chapters to give them the powers of Vicars-capitular. This subterfuge had been already employed by Louis XIV, when, during his long dispute with the Holy See, caused by his pretension to exercise the regalian rights in every diocese in France,

⁵⁰ Correspondance de Napoleon, t. XX. Letters to Comte Bigot de Preameneu, Ministre des Cultes. 10 Avril 1810—15 Avril—7 Mai—9 Mai—13 Juin.

⁵¹ Mayol de Lupe, Un Pape prisonnier, p. 473; de Chabrol's Bulletin, 11 Juillet, 1810.

⁵² See AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW of October, 1908, p. 604.

the bishops whom he nominated were refused confirmation.⁵³ The practice had been formally condemned by the second Council of Lyons in 1274, which forbade the bishops-elect to interfere in the administration of their dioceses until their election had been confirmed.⁵⁴ The Gallican Church seems, however, to have sometimes yielded to the arbitrary dictates of the King and disobeyed this law, and Cardinal Maury even boasted to Cardinal Pacca that it was he who had suggested to Napoleon this mode of avoiding the necessity of obtaining canonical institution for the bishops he had named.⁵⁵

The Prelate whose nomination, under these circumstances was followed by the most disastrous results, was the same Cardinal Maury⁵⁶ whom the Emperor made Archbishop of Paris on October 14, 1810, and whom the Chapter of Notre Dame immediately elected administrator of the diocese. The Cardinal informed the Holy

⁵³ By the "Regalian rights" the King claimed to receive the revenues of vacant Sees, and to confer the benefices without cure of souls, which belonged to them. It is difficult to trace the origin of this usage; it existed before the thirteenth century, but it is first clearly mentioned at the second Council of Lyons, presided over by Gregory X in 1274. The Council consented to tolerate it in those Churches where it existed in virtue of a foundation, or of an ancient custom, but forbade its extension to other Churches under pain of excommunication. In the beginning of the seventeenth century the Parliament of Paris proclaimed it to be a right of the Crown. In 1673, Louis XIV extended it to two-thirds of the Dioceses of France; and in 1682 by another edict, to all the Dioceses. The majority of the Bishops submitted; but Pope Innocent XI protested, and, during several years, refused to grant canonical institution to the bishops named by the King. The dispute ended in 1693; the King withdrew an edict which ordered the four articles of the Declaration of the Clergy to be taught in the faculties of theology, and gave up the immunity claimed by his Ambassador in Rome [see the *QUARTERLY* of January, 1905, p. 141]; the members of the clergy who had signed the Declaration in 1682, revoked it, and the Pope, Innocent XII, consented to the extension of the Regalian rights.—Gaetano Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica*, 1852, t. XXVII, pp. 49, 53; t. LVII, pp. 10, 15.—L'Abbe Migne, *Encyclopedie Theologique*, t. LIV, col. 708; LVI, 952.

⁵⁴ L'Abbe Migne, *Encyclopedie Theologique*, t. LIV, col. 1074.

⁵⁵ Cardinal Pacca, *Memorie storiche*, t. III, p. 37.

⁵⁶ *Correspondance diplomatique et Memoires inedits du Cardinal Maury*. Annotes et publies par Mgr. Ricard, Prelat de la Maison de La Saintete. Lille, 1891, t. II, p. 391.—Jean Siffrein Maury was born at Valreus (Vaucluse) in 1746; the son of a shoemaker. He entered the Church about 1770. He was a member of the *Etats Generaux* and of the *Assemblée Constituante* in which he was the most eloquent and courageous defender of the Church and the Throne. In 1791 he was obliged to take refuge in Germany; then went to Rome, where he was made Bishop of Montefiascone and Corneto, and Cardinal in 1794. He acted as representative in Rome of Louis XVIII, then living in exile in Russia; but in 1805 he abandoned him for Napoleon, and returned to Paris in 1806. He was named Archbishop of Paris, 14th October, 1810. After the fall of the Empire, the Chapter revoked the powers it had given him (9th April, 1814). He tried to be reconciled to the Bourbons, but was expelled from France, and the Pope deprived him of his jurisdiction as Bishop of Montefiascone. While Pius VII was absent from Rome in 1815, the Cardinals who governed in his name, sent Maury to the Castle of St. Angelo; but on the return of the Holy Father, he was forgiven on resigning his bishopric. He then led a retired life in Rome, where he died on May 10, 1817.

Father of his nomination, and that the chapter had given him power to administer the dioceses he added that the Emperor had told him to keep the See of Montefiascone and Cometo until he received canonical institution for the Archdiocese of Paris, and ended his letter with strong protestations of his attachment to religion, to the Holy See and to the pope. Pius VII replied by a brief dated November 5th, in which he expressed the deep affliction which the Cardinal's conduct had caused him. He reminded him of the reasons which obliged him to refuse to grant canonical institution to the bishops named by the Emperor. The supreme contempt manifested for the authority of the Church; the destruction of religious communities; the suppression of parishes and bishoprics, their union with each other and new delimitation, solely by the authority of the civil power. He asked him, moreover, who had freed him from the spiritual bonds which united him to the Church of Montefiascone, and "not only ordered him, but begged of him, and implored of him," (non imperamus modo, verum etiam imprecamur et obtestamur), to give up the administration of the Archdiocese. The Holy Father made no attempt to conceal his condemnation of the Cardinal's action, for he gave the brief to M. de Chabrol to forward, knowing very well that it would pass into the hands of the Minister of Worship. The Cardinal, however, paid no attention to the blame inflicted on him by the Sovereign Pontiff, and continued to govern the diocese with the fall of the Empire, alleging in a pamphlet which he published for his defence, that he had never received the brief.⁵⁷

Napoleon did not find everywhere the clergy so submissive as that of Paris. He had just then conferred the Archbishopric of Florence on Mgr. d'Osmond, bishop of Nancy, and that prelate, deceived by a false assurance that the papal confirmation would be soon forwarded, had set out for his new See. He was stopped at Piacenza by a deputation of the Canons of Florence, who informed him that a brief from the Holy Father, dated December 2d, to their Vicar Capitular, Archdeacon Corboti, had warned them that, according to ecclesiastical law (juxta canonicas ac pontificias sanctiones et vigentem Ecclesiae disciplinam), the bishop of Nancy, having been named Archbishop of Florence, was, for that reason, absolutely in-

⁵⁷ Rev. P. Caussette, Superieur des Pretres du Sacre Cour Vie du Cardinal d'Astros, Archeveque de Toulouse. Paris, 1853, p. 158.—Maury, *Memoires*, t. II, pp. 397, 459, 472. The Cardinal in his pamphlet, "Memoire pour le Cardinal Maury," Paris, 12 Mai, 1814, says that the Papal brief of November 5th was not published until Holy Saturday, April 9, 1814. "I declare that this brief never reached me." But in a reply to this pamphlet published in the *Journal des Debats* of June 4th, the writer, a deacon named Martin, assures that though the brief did not reach him officially, it was known to be in circulation in society for some years before it was published in the papers.

capable of being elected Vicar Capitular; and if he were elected, his election would be invalid and null. He could not, moreover, be transferred from one diocese to another, except by a special dispensation of the Apostolic See. The same opposition to the Imperial despotism was shown by the chapter of the diocese of Asti in Piedmont which, after consulting the Holy Father, refused to confer powers of administration on the Abbe Dejean whom the Emperor had nominated bishop of that diocese.⁵⁸

This unexpected resistance to his will rendered Napoleon furious. He sent peremptory orders to Prince Borghese to arrest the Vicar Capitular Dani and three of the Canons of Asti and imprison them at Fenestrelle, Eliza Napoleon, Grand Duchess of Tuscany, received similar instructions with regard to the Vicar Capitular of Florence, the two priests who had been sent to stop Mgr. d'Osmond and three of the Canons. She was also authorized, in case the Chapter refused to obey, to suppress it, and confiscate all the property.⁵⁹ Napoleon also commanded that the Holy Father, to whom he applied the most opprobrious language, should be treated with greater severity. The servants who helped him to carry on his correspondence, those especially, who worked the hardest, should be dismissed; all letters written by him or to him, were to be sent to Paris, except those which were insignificant; and the prefect, M. de Chabrol, was to tell him that, "since he abused his liberty to spread disorder everywhere, he could only be considered as an enemy of the State and of the Empire."⁶⁰

In spite of the close supervision exercised over the Holy Father, he was not completely deprived of all means of communication with the Church. In the course of the year 1810, committees had been secretly formed in France and in Italy for the purpose of enabling him to correspond with the outer world, as well as of assisting the exiled Cardinals. These leagues seem to have been originally planned by the members of the Congregation or Sodality of the Blessed

⁵⁸ Mayol de Lupe, *Un Pape prisonnier*. "Le Correspondant," vol. 147, 10 Mai 1887, p. 480.

⁵⁹ Lecestre, *Lettres inedites*, t. II, No. 730. Au Prince Borghese. Paris, 31 Decembre 1810.—"The Canons must be arrested, and must leave for Fenestrelle under a good escort, before the town is aware of it."—Also Nos. 732 and 740. Au General Savary, Duc de Bovigo, Ministre de la police generale.—Correspondance de Napoleon I, t. XXI, No. 17,263. A Eliza Napoleon, 2 Janvier 1811. "If you meet with any resistance from the Chapter, I authorize you to suppress it, and to sequester all its property."

⁶⁰ Lecestre, t. II, No. 731. Au Comte Bigot de Preameneu, Ministre des Cultes, 31 Decembre 1810. "Let the prefect . . . point out the hardest workers so that I may dismiss them, to take away from the Pope the means of doing harm and of spreading his poison."—No. 742. Au Prince Borghese, 2 Janvier 1811.

Virgin, founded in Paris on February 2d, 1801, by a former Jesuit, Father J. B. Delpuits, and a few students; but persons of all classes were soon enrolled in them, and that, known as l'Euvre des Caretmaux noirs, comprised some of the most distinguished members of Parisian society. The provincial branches were well organized, and a large number of young men were always ready at a moment's notice, to perform the dangerous service of acting as messengers between the Holy Father and Mgr. di Gregorio and Padre Fontana in Paris, who acted as secretaries and forwarded the papal instructions.⁶¹

One of the dignitaries of the Cathedral of Notre Dame, distinguished himself by his courageous resistance to Napoleon's despotism. The Abbe d'Astros (1772-1851) had been named Vicar General by Cardinal de Belloy, and on the death of that prelate in 1808, was elected Vicar Capitular. When Cardinal Maury was named Archbishop, the Abbe d'Astros, who was convinced that Napoleon aimed at seizing on all spiritual authority, at least over the Church of France, voted, along with some others, against the majority of the Chapter, which, in obedience to the Emperor's will, conferred on the Cardinal the administration of the diocese. Unlike Cardinal Fesch, who, when named Archbishop of Paris, in succession to Cardinal de Belloy, had resigned the See rather than administer it. Maury acted as though he had been canonically instituted. To this pretension the Abbé offered unceasing opposition; openly protesting against every attempt on the part of the Cardinal to exercise a jurisdiction, or claim privileges to which he had no right.⁶² The Abbe had received from Mgr. di Gregorio and Padre Fontana a copy of the papal brief of November 5, addressed to Cardinal Maury, and had apparently asked for further instruction, for, by another brief dated December 18th, 1810, Pius VII solemnly declared that lest there should be any doubt on the subject, he withdrew from the Cardinal "all power, faculty or jurisdiction; declaring null and of no effect, whatever should be done to the contrary, knowingly or through ignorance."⁶³

⁶¹ Geoffroy de Grandmaison, *La Congregation (1801-1830)*. Paris, 1889, pp. 105, 108, 109.

⁶² Caussette, *Vie du Cardinal de Astros*, p. 177.—Mgr. Ricard, *Mem. du Card. Maury*, t. II, p. 398, "Instead of sheltering his doubtful situation beneath the undisputed authority of the Vicars-Capitular, he put himself daringly forward (*audacieusement en relief*) and could not have behaved otherwise if he had possessed the canonical institution."

⁶³ Caussette, *Pieces justificatives*, p. xxxiii. "Et nihilominus ne ullus supersit dubitandi aut interpretandi locus, et ad uberiorem cautelam, omnem ei potestatem, facultatem aut jurisdictionem adimimus: irritum ac inane declarantes quidquid secus super his scienter vel ignoranter attentari contigerit." The text of the three briefs, to Cardinal Maury, to Archdeacon Corboli, and

This brief did not reach the Abbe d'Astros; it was seized by the police either at Savona, or while on its way to Paris, and was not published until the month of November, 1814, as the Abbe stated in his letter to Pius VII on the 23d of that month. The Emperor, however, soon learned the arrival and the secret circulation in Paris of a brief to Cardinal Maury, in which the Pope reproached him with having accepted an Archbishopric from the oppressor of the Holy See, and thus betrayed the interests of the Church which he had, formerly, so gloriously defended. He was also informed that another brief nullifying all Cardinal Maury's acts had been addressed to the Abbe d'Astros, and the irritation, which the brief to the Canons of Florence had already caused him, was thus still more intensified. His indignation was soon manifested by a sudden outburst.⁶⁴

When on January 1st, 1811, at the usual official reception at the Tuileries of the great functionaries of the State, Cardinal Maury presented his Canons and Vicar General, Napoleon said angrily to the Abbe d'Astros: "You are the man whom I suspect the most in all my Empire. One must be French before everything and maintain the Gallican liberties. There is as much difference between the religion of Bassuet and that of Gregory VII, as between heaven and hell." Then, putting his hand on the hilt of his sword, "At any rate, I carry a sword; beware!" The Abbe made no reply to this cowardly threat and the Emperor, retiring to his study, sent for Savary Duke of Rovigo, the Minister of Police, and told him to arrest d'Astros. Savary then asked Cardinal Maury to bring d'Astros to see him; and the Cardinal told the Abbe that he would take him in his carriage to the house of the Duke, who wanted to ask him some questions, but that he had nothing to fear. At the Duke's he was asked if he did not correspond with the Pope at Savona, and he replied that it was his duty to apply for dispensations. Had he seen a brief from the Pope to Cardinal Maury? He had; but he refused to say who had shown it to him, and he also refused to give

to the Abbe d'Astros, is in Caussette, *Pieces justificatives*, Nos. iii, iv, v.

The Abbe d'Astros in his letter to Pius VII (November 23, 1814) observes that it had been a custom in the French Church, though not in conformity with Canon law, to confer on the bishop elect the title of Vicar-capitular, as a purely honorary title of which the bishop never made use. Cardinal Fesch, when named Archbishop of Paris, in succession to Cardinal de Belloy, received the title, and the Abbe d'Astros had then no doubt as to the legality of the act. Afterwards, he studied the question carefully, and then saw what was his duty. Cardinal Fesch, however, never took any part in the administration, and when ordered by Napoleon to make use of the powers conferred on him, resigned the See to the Emperor's great indignation, rather than obey.—Caussette, pp. 172, 173. *Pieces justificatives*, p. lviii, No. VIII.

⁶⁴ Le Comte Jauffret, *Memoires historiques sur les affaires ecclesiastiques de France*. Paris, 1823, t. II, p. 380.—Caussette, p. 183.

up his charge of Vicar Capitular. The Abbe was questioned for some days by Savary and by Real, a Councillor of State, but he steadily refused to name the persons from whom he had received the papal brief, or those to whom he had shown it. The cunning tactics, however, of Savary, who deceived him by his falsehoods, at last drew from him a confession that he had shown it to his cousin, Count Portalis, Councillor of State, and to two priests. The Abbe was at once sent to the fortress of Vincennes (4 January, 1811), where he was at first kept for nearly a year in solitary confinement (*au secret*), and where he remained until transferred to the prisons of Angers in February, 1814. He was not released until the fall of the Empire, in April of the same year. Letters seized among the Abbe's papers revealed to the police that Mgr. di Gregorio and Padre Fontana had served as intermediaries between the Holy Father and the French clergy. They were immediately arrested; it was then found that they also consulted Cardinal di Pietro, and as Cardinals Oppizzoni and Gabrielli were living with him at Semur, they too, were seized and these five faithful servants of the Sovereign Pontiff were sent to Vincennes.⁶⁵ The fury felt by Napoleon on meeting with this unconquerable resistance to his despotism on the part of the Holy Father, may be perceived from the letter which he wrote to his librarian, M. Barbier, asking him to forward, as soon as possible, the result of the researches he had made to find if there had been Emperors who had suspended or deposed Popes.⁶⁶

In consequence of the publication of these three briefs the measures adopted to hinder all communications between the Holy Father and the Church became still more severe. On the night of January 7th the prefect, M. de Chabrol, and some of his officials made a careful examination of the rooms occupied by the papal household, and carried away all the books and papers which they found. The papal servants were deprived of pens and ink, and those who had helped the Holy Father in his correspondence were placed in a separate part of the building and cut off from all communication with him.⁶⁷ A few days later, on January 13th, while the Pope was walking in the little garden attached to his dwelling,

⁶⁵ Caussette, pp. 185, 256.—Count Joseph Marie Portalis (1778-1858), son of Napoleon's first minister of worship, Councillor of State, 1806. Napoleon, in a violent fit of rage, expelled him publicly from the Council and banished him from Paris for not having revealed to him that he had seen the Papal brief. Pardoned in 1813 and named President of the Court of Angers; President of the *Cour de Cassation* in 1824; Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1829; was named Senator under the second Empire.

⁶⁶ Correspondance de Napoleon, t. XXI, No. 17,266. Note pour le Bibliothecaire de l'Empereur. Paris, 5 Janvier 1811.

⁶⁷ Mayol de Lupe, "Le Correspondant," vol. 147, p. 753; de Chabrol's letters, 8th and 10th January, 1811.

his rooms were entered, the lock of his desk forced; his trunks and presses searched; his clothes and his bed examined; and all his papers and books sealed up and taken away; even his breviaries and his Office of the Blessed Virgin. The Holy Father merely remarked when he heard of it: "What will they do with the Office of Our Lady?"

But these acts of violence did not appease Napoleon's anger and he was still resolved to deprive the Holy Father of all freedom and independence. He ordered Prince Borghese, the Governor of the Departments beyond the Alps, to inform the Pope that he was forbidden to correspond with any Church, or with any of the Emperor's subjects. All suspected persons were to be removed from his household, and no one was to be allowed to visit him. He was to be deprived of pens, paper and ink. "Since nothing can render the Pope sensible, he shall see that I am powerful enough to do what my predecessors have done, and depose a Pope."⁶⁸

Similar to this must have been the letter which the Emperor sent by special carrier, and which the Pope refused to open. After two days, M. de Chabrol found it still sealed, and opening it, read it to the Holy Father; although even he was shocked by the insolence of the Emperor's language who threatened to assemble in Paris a Council of all his bishops and to depose the pope. The Holy Father replied by placing the letter at the foot of his crucifix, and said: "I lay this dispatch at the feet of Christ; it is He who shall avenge me, for the cause is no longer mine but His own."⁶⁹

The close supervision exercised over the Holy Father, was then made still more stringent. The inns of Savona and the roads leading to the town were carefully watched; the number of sentinels about the Pope's apartments was increased; his servants were spied; they were even obliged to send out their linen to the wash under the inspection of the gendarmes. At last, by orders from Paris, the persons in whom the Holy Father had most confidence, Don Giovanni, Soglia, his chaplain; Ceccarini, his surgeon; Giuseppe Moiraghi and Andrea Morelli, his valets, and Bortoni, a groom, were suddenly taken away without being allowed to see him, and

⁶⁸ Lecestre, *Lettres inedites*, t. II, No. 747. Au Prince Borghese. Paris, 6 Janvier 1811.

⁶⁹ British Museum. Additional manuscripts, No. 8389. *Lettere e documenti relativi alla deportazione di Pio VII.*—A description of the life of Pius VII at Savona, by his *Ajutante di Camera* (first valet) Giuseppe Moiraghi.—The words of Pius VII were, "A piedi di questo Cristo metto il dispaccio, tocca ad Esso fare le mie vendette, perche non e piu causa mia, ma Sua propria causa."

sent to Fenestrelle, where they were imprisoned for seven months. The Holy Father was thus completely isolated from the world.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

WAS LUTHER'S FATHER A HOMICIDE?

AN HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

THE motive that prompted Hans Luther, the father of the Reformer, to leave his home at Möhra with such precipitate haste, where his forefathers dwelt for generations, if not centuries, abandon his little property, jeopardize the life of his wife, who was on the eve of her confinement, submit to the ordeal of a seventy-five or eighty-mile journey on foot, begin life anew amid strangers and strange surroundings, has been one of the moot questions that the Luther biographer had to grapple with for centuries. It still begs an answer. Some dismiss it peremptorily without a mention; others slur it over as if it were historically valueless; those who allude to it, do so with a hesitant decision that leaves the mind unsatisfied, or with a magisterial superficiality that in advance predicates its untrustworthiness. The result of such an inquiry, though it would be only to establish its falsity or truth, would certainly be a valuable contribution to history. Psychologically, and measured by the laws of hereditariness, it would prove to be far from useless, for the reason that the involuntary manslaughter of Hans Luther was admittedly an act of unrestrained anger. It would thus give us a key to the universally admitted ungovernable temper of his son, as a congenitally transmitted trait. And if the pursuit of this inquiry should be pushed further along the same line, and reveal that this overmastering passion of anger was alike the heritage of the Luther posterity, as it was the possession of its ancestry, it would shed a welcome light on many vexatious biographic problems that confront us in dealing with the Reformer.

We have made this inquiry the subject of some study and research, and believe it will be a welcome consideration to submit to the attention of open-minded readers and critical students, without committing ourselves one way or the other.

In 1862 and 1863 two works dealing with the boyhood and ancestry of Martin Luther made their appearance in London. These

works¹ evidently created little serious attention at the time of publication, though the first reached a second edition. Both, as far as our knowledge goes, were never drawn upon by the leading Luther biographers. The casual mention of the author's name—Mayhew—by Köstlin, probably the best informed Luther specialist of Germany, led to a search in some of our larger libraries, with the result that the second work, which deals most circumstantially with the subject under discussion, devoting to it no less than ninety-seven pages, was fortunately found.

Henry Mayhew (1812-1887) was a man of distinguished literary attainments, a voluminous and versatile author, a close student of social economy, a philanthropist of some note, but perhaps best known as one of the Mayhew brothers who founded *London Punch*. It was he who made Luther the subject of a close, careful, critical study. As he himself tells us in the opening sentence of his preface to the second work, "it sprang out of certain inquiries into the early life of Martin Luther—for the due prosecution of which it was necessary to visit the principal Lutheran localities." This he did at the sacrifice of considerable time, with methodic design, observant eye and ready pencil; and though a staunch Protestant, with an unconcealed anti-Catholic bias, and an enthusiastic admirer of the Reformer, he acquits himself with honest, fearless objectivity.

He found Möhra on the border of the Thuringian Forest. At the time it had not risen to the dignity meriting a mention on the map, though from time immemorial it was the home of the Luthers. The hamlet consisted of a small collection of seventy or eighty detached homes, of a most primitive character, and mostly with adjoining farmyards. With the exception of a solitary carpenter and shoemaker, both of whom seldom had occasion to ply their trades, the five hundred inhabitants were mostly woodcutters and farmers.²

In tracing the genealogical tree of the Luthers, which concerns us most intimately now, he draws frequently and copiously on a Lutheran clergyman, who as the historian of Möhra is not unknown to Lutheran students, and whose brother was still living in the village at the time of our author's visit. Johann Conrad Ortmann, who was pastor of the neighboring parish, Steinbach-bei-Bad Liebenstein, gave us a work of much archival interest and valuable local traditions.³ After dealing in a chronological study of the Luthers, Ortmann, as quoted by Mayhew, tells us that "the Luther family were

¹ The Boyhood of Martin Luther, London, 1862 and—German Life and Manners as seen in Saxony, London, 1863, 2 vols.

² The town now numbers six hundred inhabitants of whom in 1901, six families still belonged to the Luthers.

³ Möhra der Stammort Dr. Martin Luthers, Salzungen, 1844.

originally well-to-do; the next of kin, the youngest brother on the one hand (Hans the Little, as he was called) had property in Möhra; and the eldest brother, on the other hand (Heinz Luther), had still, in the year 1527, a farmhouse of his own; and the Möhra family, besides, were even down to 1521 in such good circumstances that Dr. Martin Luther could be lodged and entertained by them when in after life he visited his father's relatives in his father's native village." How can it naturally have come to pass, then, that Hans Luther (Martin's father) got to be so poor? Hans Luther, Ortmann continues, "also had some fortune at the commencement of his life. He was a *Bauer* (literally, a peasant proprietor) in Möhra, as Dr. Martin Luther himself says, and consequently must have had some estate. Indeed, it has been before shown that he was entitled to one-third part of the property of Heine (Heinz Luther), Martin's grandfather; whilst, according to the registry of hereditary estates made out in 1676, it is manifest that Hans Luther did become possessed of such property."⁴

However, now arises the historical crux, extending over four hundred years, in accounting for Luther's birth at Eisleben, November 10, 1483. "What could have been the cause," Ortmann asks, which induced Hans Luther to take such a step? To suddenly decamp with his wife and children—with his wife, too, be it remembered, far advanced in pregnancy—to quit and utterly abandon the place of his birth, the home of his childhood and the site of all his property?"⁵

The explanations of this step were many, but made on so precarious a basis that one soon supplanted the other. One of the contentions was—and it did service for a century or more—that on account of the suspension of all work at the slate mines in Möhra, Hans Luther, to avoid an enforced idleness and better his condition, removed to Eisleben. But this is summarily brushed aside by the documentary evidence that precisely in the fifteenth century the mines of Möhra were worked to their full capacity, were never more productive or prosperous. This our historian with Germanic preciseness proves by quoting from contemporaneous mining records.⁶ From these he shows that between the years 1456 to 1496 several church bells were cast out of the ore obtained from the Kupfersuhl mines, at which it is said Hans Luther worked.

The further explanation, at one time universally accepted, embodied by Seckendorf and even now repeated, was that first given

⁴ German Life and Manners, etc., I. 69-70.

⁵ Ib. 71.

⁶ Heim's, Henneberger Chronik: Bruckner's Kirchen-und Schulenstaat.

by Nicholas Rebhahn, the Lutheran Church Superintendent at Eisenach, about two centuries after the event. This was to the effect that Hans Luther took his wife, on the eve of her confinement to the "year-market" at Eisleben. "Surely," reflects Ortmann, "no one but a dealer or merchant ever dreams of going to a year-market in a town which is from twenty-eight to thirty hours' journey on foot away from his own residence; and such is the distance of Eisleben from Möhra." The deathblow of this legend was, however, given by the historian of Mansfeld and pastor of Helbra-Krumhaar.⁷ He proves that the year-market never occurred in the month of November. On the contrary, up to 1515, thirty-two years after Luther's birth, the Eisleben year-markets were only held on the Monday after *Cantate* Sunday in April, and on St. Lambert's Day, 17th September.

Ortmann naturally comes to the conclusion "that there must have been some *other* cause than such as is ordinarily assigned. What, then, was the other cause?"⁸

With Mayhew every logical mind will have to agree, that "whatever may have been the cause of Hans Luther's sudden departure from Möhra, the circumstances attending it must have been of the most pressing nature to compel the miner to leave with such unseemly haste, and to take his wife with him too, even though she was brought to bed with young Martin the day after her arrival at Eisleben."⁹ The motive of attending a year-market under the circumstances he rejects as absurd, for the reason that these were held nearer and were of a more advantageous character at Eisenach and Salsungen. If the removal had its birth in the desire to better his condition by working at the mines at Mansfeld, what was the necessity of doing it in such an intemperate hurry and with such uncalled-for stealthiness, especially when it involved the very life of his wife? Hans Luther's departure was a flight, "and men do not fly from their homes except on occasions of the greatest urgency."¹⁰

"The simple fact, then," according to our author, "would appear to be that Hans Luther (as Martin Michaelis tells us in his description of the mines and smelting houses at Kupfersuhl—a work which was first published in the year 1702), Martin's father, had in a dispute stricken a herdsman dead to the earth, by means of a horse bridle which he happened to have in his hand at the time, and was

⁷ Dr. Martin Luther's Vaterhaus in Mansfeld, p. 76.

⁸ Mayhew I, 74.

⁹ Ib. 75.

¹⁰ Ib. 76.

thereupon forced to abscond from the officers of justice as hurriedly as he could."¹¹

Of course this was met with a chorus of protest and denial, and was promptly ascribed to the machinations of the Reformer's Catholic opponents. The Catholics did make the charge in Luther's lifetime, as we will presently see. Here we have an independent declaration from Luther's own townsmen and coreligionists, uttered in absolute ignorance of the Catholic charge, but completely substantiating it.

"Johann Martin Michaelis"—we are quoting Mayhew, who in turn is quoting Ortmann—"tells the tale in his 'Description of the Mining and Smelting Works in Kupfersuhl in the Year 1702.' Here are the words of Michaelis: 'I cannot pass over in silence the fact that the reverend and renowned Dr. Luther's father originally dwelt in the neighborhood of Möhra, and worked in the pit as a miner. But he was afterwards very unfortunate, for with his own horse bridle he accidentally struck down a herdsman dead upon the grass; whereupon he was forced to retire from the neighborhood. So, in order to get the same work as he had previously been doing, he betook himself with his wife (though she was on the eve of being confined with Dr. Luther at the time) to Eisleben, in which neighborhood the couple remained ever afterwards.'"¹²

"This misfortune of Hans Luther," continues Ortmann, "lives still in the minds of the Möhra peasantry. The villagers there tell you not only the same tale, but they show you the very spot—the field in which the tragedy occurred. Should any travelling admirer of Martin Luther pay a visit to Möhra, he may see the meadow which was the scene of the catastrophe, if he will but go along the lower part of the village, by the road called Röhrigsgasse, and pursue the way towards the Röhrigshof. For about 400 or 500 paces from the village, on the right-hand side of the way—just where the road going from Möhra out of the Röhrigshof makes the bend—there the field lies."¹³

One of our author's main objects of the trip was to trace the story, in which his interest had been intensely aroused, as near as possible to its source, to probe it in all its bearings, and satisfy his mind with some settled conclusion. He disclaims all sectarian bias, and claims, and no doubt with manifest sincerity, to search for truth alone. He was not many hours in Möhra, where he spent a fortnight, before he found Ortmann's account strictly correct. He did not hesitate to make inquiries in every direction of all present, but

¹¹ *Ib.*

¹² *Ib.* p. 78.

¹³ *Ib.* 78-79.

invariably every peasant knew the same story and could point out the identical spot. The oldest inhabitants particularly were cross-examined closely, but only to add to the cumulative evidence. "All the Möhra folk had had the tale told them by their grandfathers, and they had it from their grandfathers before them."¹⁴ He finds the story so commonly and unquestioningly accepted, believes the local tradition, which is without a dissenting voice, so implicitly, that he no longer doubts its credibility. "Sum up all these matters," is his conclusion, "and a mass of evidence is cumulated upon which surely no twelve common jurymen in their common senses would hesitate to bring in a verdict of—Guilty."¹⁵

In rummaging the old parish archives in search of further documentary evidence, in which search the local authorities afforded him every privilege and help, and which was of so extensive a character that it demands an entire chapter, he came upon further proof. This was to the effect that, like the ancestry of Luther's family, its posterity were involved in criminal acts of violence, no doubt traceable to the same temperamental source. Thus he found that Sebastian Luther, a private in the army of the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, was found guilty of manslaughter in 1715, when he killed one of his comrades, and escaped the penalty by deserting with his horse. The other tragic chapter of what Mayhew calls "this strange and wayward Luther family," was that of Martin Luther, named after his illustrious ancestor, who as late as 1861, in a drunken rage, in the presence of his little child who summoned him to dinner, "drew his knife across his own throat with one hand, and then with the other, and fell almost headless on the floor at his offspring's feet."¹⁶

Thus far we have followed Mayhew, whose research was not only minute and painstaking, but his keen eye and alert mind give his personal investigation more than ordinary weight. Are his results supported by other authorities unknown and inaccessible to him?

We shall briefly touch upon some of these, and even at the risk of being wearisomely prolix shall draw upon them even to their *ipsissima verba*. It will be noticed that in many instances these narrators are Lutheran clergymen, and in all consistent Protestants.

The Lutheran pastor Böttcher, in a work of some magnitude,¹⁷ states: "According to tradition, Hans Luther, on account of an accidentally committed homicide, had to flee." John Carl Salomo

¹⁴ Ib. 82.

¹⁵ Ib. 94.

¹⁶ Ib. 113.

¹⁷ *Germania Sacra*. Ein topographischer Führer durch die Kirchen und Schulgeschichte deutscher Lande, 1874, p. 174.

Thon, ducal chamberlain at Eisenach, adverts to the same incident in these words: "The causes that led to the hasty change of residence are variously given and not at all consistent," and then goes on to quote the above cited passage from Michaelis. To dissipate any suspicion that the tale may have had a Catholic origin, he goes on: "In all printed narratives, even Weisslinger's defamatory *Friss Vogel*, I never met this story, which I submit to the further examination of adepts in church history."¹⁸ Thiersch (Heinrich W. J.), a Protestant theologian and professor at Marburg, fully subscribes to the same opinion concerning the homicide, and adds: "In order to explain Hans Luther's emigration in winter and amid the necessitous condition of the family, the tradition must be admitted as trustworthy."¹⁹ To Karl Luther, living at Rudersdorf, near Wittenberg, who instituted minute genealogical studies about the Luthers, the story is so plausible that he not only gives it his unqualified acceptance, but in deprecatory terms claims that "it is foolish to beat about the bush where facts are at stake, no matter how unpalatable they may be, for after all they alone can give the key to unaccounted incidents," and "accordingly it is almost unpardonable, when the biographers of Luther and the historians of the Reformation, have on this point copied from one another without the slightest regard whether their assertions have an historical basis or not."²⁰

It is unnecessary and superfluous to add the further testimony of Schenkel,²¹ Bayne,²² and other noted Protestant writers who have accepted the admissibility of the story.

It was stated above that the charge of Hans Luther's homicide was not a recent tradition, but a charge made in Luther's lifetime. It was then made by a man whom Luther himself eulogistically speaks of when in his following, in the shadow of the house that cradled the Reformer at Eisleben, in the face of the most withering opposition, a few miles from Mansfeld, where Hans Luther had but a few years before died (May 29, 1530), after five years' familiarity with all the news of the small town. Yet, strange as it may appear, all research thus far has failed to show a tittle of evidence that it was ever challenged, denied or even noticed. In fact, the whole Reformation literature available at this day seems to ignore it absolutely.

¹⁸ Schloss Wartburg. Ein Beytrag zur Kunde der Vorzeit. Gotha, 1792, p. 133.

¹⁹ Luther, Gustav Adolf und Maximilian I von Bayern. Nördlingen, 1869, p. 165.

²⁰ Geschichtliche Notizen über M. Luthers Vorfahren. Wittenberg, 1869, pp. 29-31.

²¹ Martin Luther, Berlin, 1870, p. 7.

²² Martin Luther, London, 1887, I 92.

George Wicelius (1502-1573) (Wizel or Witzel), who in the estimation of Luther was "a very learned and capable man,"²³ whom Kawerau characterizes as "one of the most interesting personalities among the Catholic theologians of the Reformation period," and while a Lutheran, elicited the warm commendation of his coreligionists for earnestness, zeal and learning,²⁴ left the priesthood, which he had entered under undue pressure of parental influence, married, and became an active adherent of Luther in 1524. Repenting his step, he came back to the Church in 1531. At the instance of Count Hoyer of Mansfeld, who continued loyal to the Church, he accepted the pastorate of St. Andrew's, Eisleben. His five years there (1533-1538) were "of the most bitter warfare with Agricola, Gützl, Cölius, Jonas, Cordatus, Kymäus, Balthasar Raida and other theologians of the opposition" (Kawerau). The first four held pastorates in Eisleben.

It was this well-equipped, ready, productive and fearless antagonist of the Reformation who first called Luther's father a homicide, and that at three several times—1535, 1537 and 1565—and moreover in public print. It is needless to enter the details that called forth the little volume²⁵ in which this is found. Justus Jonas assailed the integrity of the father of Wicelius, which the latter resents as totally irrelevant to the case under discussion, for if such an argument possessed validity "I could call the father of your Luther a homicide." *Sed si ita commodet causae publicae possim ego p. luteri tui homicidium dicere.*²⁶ In this controversy Wicelius shows a surprising familiarity with the private antecedents and domestic secrets of his opponents, who were resident pastors in Eisleben. He had to act with sober deliberation and unassailable certainty in dealing with them, and a vulnerable point in his assertions would have invited humiliating disgrace and hopeless discomfiture.

The same assertion he repeats in 1537. In this year he published a collection of his letters.²⁷ In this collection the author includes his letter *De Raptu Epistolae*, and while making a correction of a former mistake, maintains the same charge *verbatim*.

A third time the homicidal charge comes to light in a writing of 1545, but only published in Paris in 1565 under the pseudonym

²³ DeWette, III 48.

²⁴ Dollinger, *Die Reformation*, Regensburg, 1846, I 20, 21, et. seqq.

²⁵ *De Raptu epistolae privatae et praefixa illi criminatione*, with it *Contra Ludum Sylv. Hessi. Expostulatio Cum Hoste Jona Georg. Vuicelius Anno M. D. XXXV*, no imprint.

²⁶ Fol. 6, b. a.

²⁷ *Epistolarum . . . libri quatuor Georgii Wicelii. Lipsiae, Excudebat N. Vuolrab, 1537.*

Bonifacius Britannus, which an eminent Catholic Reformation scholar—Dr. Nicholas Paulus—traces to Wicelius with certainty. It bears a rather aggressive title,²⁸ and was attached to the *Historia J. Cochlaei de actis et scriptis M. Lutheri Saxonis*. The *Antidotus* deplores the growth of Lutheranism, and judges it by the fruits of the Reformation. To him the argument that “before the son of the homicide of Möhra was born, there was no Gospel of Christ in Germany, and no knowledge of the Word of God,” was preposterous.²⁹

Now, this Parisian publication could hardly have remained unknown in Germany, for Wicelius was a theologian of prominence and a writer of brilliancy. It appeared, in fact, in a German version,³⁰ and to-day can be found in the larger public or national libraries of Europe.

How can we account for the deadly secrecy that shrouded the vernacular, ignored the Latin, and, by what seems a conspiracy of silence, doomed the whole story to oblivion? It is fully admitted that it is hard to explain how, in the relentless polemical conflicts of the Reformation period, the Catholic controversialists failed to avail themselves of this formidable weapon. But even more inexplicable is the studied silence of the Lutheran theologians and historians in not giving such serious charges a syllable of explanation, a word of denial, not to speak of scathingly denouncing it as a falsehood.

In conclusion, we beg to add the following observation, which it will be admitted is vitally germane to our subject. This is—the wild passion of anger was an unextinguished and unmodified heritage transmitted congenitally to the whole Luther family, and this to such an extent that the *Luther-zorn* (Luther rage) has attained the currency of a German colloquialism. Collectively it is graphically summarized by the Saxon archivist Brückner on the basis of archival research, and the official court dockets of Salzungen, the seat of the judicial district. “Möhra,” is the contention of this official, “has attained the reputation for its rough and brusque character, because in the leading groups of its relationships, especially in the Luther branch, it possessed a tough and unyielding metal, and accordingly allowed itself to be drawn to a condition of refractoriness and querulous self-defense. To the police treasury of Salzungen, Möhra, with its rough-and-ready methods, was a welcome and rich source of revenue, for, as the police dockets show, the village was

²⁸ *Pro evangelistarum ac sectarum nostri temporis, maxime Lutherismi peste publica reprimenda, admonitio, sive Antidotus. Bonifacio Britanno, Germane auctore, apud Guilielm Chaudiere, via Jacobaea cum privilegio Regis.*

²⁹ *Igitur antequam nasceretur filius homicidae Morensis, non fuit Evangelium Christi in Germania, nulla verba Dei cognitio.*

³⁰ *Praservativ, Cur und Seelen Artzney. Ingolstadt, 1581.*

mulcted again and again for acts of violence which its inhabitants committed, now in political or church parties, now as individuals, and foremost among them the Luthers. The parish manifested so determined an opposition and obstinacy against the legal authorities, as well as parochial, as to culminate in the brutal act of shooting at the household of the pastor. The condition of the neighbors adjoining the town, whose ready recourse to arms, knives, scythes—nightly brawls and public blasphemies—are often alluded to and fined. In these the Luther clan is mostly involved, for it carried on its 'feuds' with others—strikes, wounds, resists—and is ever ready at self-vindication and self-defense. Out of the gnarly wood of this relationship, consisting mostly of powerful, pugnacious farmers, assertive of their rights, Luther's father grew."³¹

It will hardly be denied that this characterization on the whole applied to Hans Luther, and that, moreover, on evidence well known and abstracting from the homicide charge. It was the severity of his son Martin's home life—cold, stern, sunless; the uncontrolled rage which beat him until he actually became a fugitive from home; the inflexible rigor of even his mother, who punished him until the blood flowed, that not only forced him, according to his own confession, into the monastery,³² but shattered his nervous system for life.³³

And if we admit the leading laws of heredity, this may account for the fact, as Mayhew states it, "that Martin was a veritable chip of the hard old block," and with reasons, no doubt crudely scientific but picturesquely apposite, goes on, "If a gouty father, or a consumptive mother, in the usual course of nature, beget a podagric or phthisic child, surely one with a temper as fiery as a blood-horse may be expected to cast a high-mettled foal."³⁴ It may account for that "terrible temper" of the Reformer, which was a dread to his antagonists, a shock to refined ears, a mortification to his friends, a sorrow to his intimates and an indelible stain on his apologetics.

H. G. GANSS.

Carlisle, Pa.

³¹ Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte, III 38.

³² Tischreden, Frankfurt, 1567, p. 314.

³³ Hausrath, Luthers Leben, Berlin, 1904, I. 22.

³⁴ German Life and Manners, I. 95.

SOME GAELIC REVIVAL PIONEERS.

TWO separate revivals in letters have been witnessed in our day, both on an extensive scale. Both had the common object of atoning for a great fault of preceding generations in regard to a language and a literature rich in idealism and poetry. To allow so precious a human possession to languish and finally lapse into desuetude was a relapse into barbarism, in a measure. This was the case with regard to the language and literature of Provence, in the south of France; and a similar movement is now in progress with regard to the language and literature of ancient Ireland. It is not a little remarkable that these two revivals should arise spontaneously and at the same period, without any preconcerted understanding among the moving spirits of both. It is all the more remarkable because of the circumstance that the general tendency of the age is averse from idealism and passionately materialistic.

But there is another element in the case that suggests a kind of psychic sympathy among races as well as among individuals. This is the identity of race inherited by the peoples among whom those revivals had birth. The Celts of Gaul and those of Ireland were almost identical as to race and language at the period when the Romans crossed the mountains to begin the conquest of Gaul. The descendants of both branches of the gifted primal stock possess much the same temperamental characteristics to-day as they exhibited when first they came into prominence on the stage of history. Brave in battle, ardent in love, reverent in religion, glowing in poetry, transcendental in music, tender in affection, they are still all that Davis so happily depicts them in his "Lament for the Milesians."

Their hearts were as soft as the child's in the lap,

But they were the men in the gap—

that is, when it came to the matter of fighting. They were the ancestors of Con of the Hundred Battles, or Con the Hundred-Fighter, as some translators render the title, Nial, Brian, and other famous warriors of the blood of Heber and Heremon, the first Milesians who came to settle down in the land of Erin.

Widely different, however, were the auspices under which the two movements originated. While the rich and the learned smiled on the crusade begun by Frederic Mistral and his fellow *Félibres*, snobs in England and Ireland looked askance and frowned their disapprobation over the suggestion that the ancient language and literature of Ireland were as worthy of resuscitation as those of Provence. The Irish themselves had become so demoralized and de-

graded by their slavery as to have grown ashamed of their native tongue. The dons of Trinity College declared that to study such works as the *Seanchus Mor* and the *Brehon Laws* was to throw away so much valuable time; while others of them gave out the verdict that the great bardic epics of the Ossianic cycle were so disfigured by indecency that they could not be recommended to students. More recent investigation shows that the latter objection is untenable. The epics are, on the contrary, much more free from the stain of sensual thought than the ancient compositions of any of the old races who put their ideas into verse.

It seems to be forgotten by a good many critics of the Irish people that England deliberately set about the extirpation of the ancient language of Ireland. Its continued existence made the work of conquest slow and difficult. When Saxon and Celt met on the field of battle the Saxon was at one disadvantage: he could not comprehend the words of command issued by the leaders of the Irish, while these who, were often bilingual, could nearly all understand his generals' commands. The invaders hated the language, because it was the speech of their enemy, and furthermore because they could not understand it. Therefore, though utterly ignorant of it, they pronounced it to be a barbarous jargon. Even well-educated men like Spenser and Camden so regarded it. A law was passed banning it from the schools of the cities of the Pale and making the teaching of it a penal offence. After some time, however, it dawned upon the persecutors' minds that they could never hope to make many proselytes in Ireland for their new religion unless they could address them in their own language, and so a few men like Ussher and Bedell began the study of Gaelic. Ussher, who was a kindly and well-meaning prelate, achieved proficiency in the language sufficient to enable him to translate the Bible into the language. But it is not hazardous to say that this was a case of "Love's labor lost," as far as the winning of souls to the religion of Elizabeth and James was concerned. But the patient dint of persecution in time bore such fruit that the Irish began to grow ashamed of the language that their persecutors proclaimed to be barbarous and unsuitable for civilized life. Those who knew it, and knew English as well, sometimes affected ignorance of it before the "Sassenach," and it was often very difficult for assize courts to get Irish witnesses to admit that they understood their native tongue, so deeply had the iron of cruel persecution entered the peasant's soul. Under such untoward conditions it was little wonder the flower of the national speech languished almost to death. It was by the genius and enthusiasm of a gifted woman that it was preserved from the death

that seemed inevitable during the dark and melancholy cycle that saw the close of the Penal Age.

Miss Charlotte Brooke, daughter of a brilliant scholar, Henry Brooke, the son of an Episcopal clergyman of the County Cavan, was the first pioneer in the movement for the resuscitation of the Gaelic speech. She lived a good deal at times among the Irish-speaking population, and, being of a romantic and inquisitive turn of mind, began to feel an interest in the language and history of the people over whom her class and the English officials lorded it as a garrison of conquerors. She inherited a generous spirit from her father, a man so imbued with the instinct of freedom that it shone through the pages of some of his literary works—as in a play of his called “*Gustavus Vasa*” which was so obnoxious to the Hanoverian Government of the day that it was prohibited by the censor. Miss Brooke was one of twenty-two children which the distinguished Cavan man had to his credit; and she was his brightest pearl. Her literary output was very creditable for such an age and such an unpromising set of surroundings. The family lived, when in Ireland, at a place called Rantavan, in Cavan, where Henry Brooke was born in the year 1706, and his daughter Charlotte thirty-four years later. She wrote many poems and essays for British magazines, but her most valuable work was done in the Irish field. She left two notable monuments of her labors in the Gaelic literary vineyard, to wit—Walker’s “*Historical Memoirs of Irish Bards*” and “*Reliques of Irish Poetry*” (published in London in 1788). These works opened the eyes of the English reading world for the first time to the nobility of the Irish language as a poetical vehicle and a perfection of scientific lingual construction, rhythmic, euphonious, and beautifully flexible in adaptation. Miss Brooke spent only two years in gaining a complete mastery of the Gaelic language, once she had made up her mind that it was a worthy field of literary study. This fact suggests the prevalence of the native tongue, at that period, in portions of the country from which it has since entirely disappeared. Even in the large cities and towns, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the principal shopkeepers always kept employes in their service who could converse with the customers from the rural districts who flocked into town on market and fair days to make their purchases for the coming week or the year, out of the proceeds of their farm products, animate or inanimate, as the case might be. The great famine of 1846-47 ended this condition. Most of the thousands whom it mowed down spoke only the tongue of the Gael.

About the same time that Henry Brooke and his daughter

moved as stars in the literary firmament the Irish swan was singing her death-note, both in poetry and music. The Jacobite movement had brought it forth. There is a rich legacy of ballads and airs in the Munster minstrelsy of the Jacobite period. The language was Irish, the music bore the distinctive impress of the transcendental Gaelic mind, as it wanders in the entrancing fields of the spirit and fancy. There is something more than a subtle connection between the power of music and the structure of the language to which it is applied. Euphony is the principle worked out in the construction of the Greek language and the Irish language, both of immemorial antiquity, and the music of both nations thus became mated to a language of majestic grace like the Belvederean Apollo. The more recent Italian adopted the same rippling rhythmic system, and the result is known to all the musical world. It is the highest exemplification of rich and resonant musical efflorescence that the stage at least is cognizant of. Charming and dazzling as it is, however, there is more to delight the ear and ravish the fancy in the ancient melodies of the Irish musicians than any Italian composition has ever yet offered. Historians of music believe that many of the airs selected for the political and sentimental songs of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the Jacobite movement, were chosen precisely because they were very old and very dear to the people. It should not be forgotten that the mediaeval Irish had, besides the ordinary notation by staves and points, another curious kind of musical character resembling the musical accents of the Greeks and learned by them from the Latin-speaking clerics of the fifth and sixth centuries.

The alternation of vowel and consonant, which is the foundation of euphony, must have first suggested the idea of notated music. No theory genesis can be clearer, on the principle of circumstantial evidence. The Irish monks, besides being the schoolmasters were the music-masters of Europe, from the sixth century down to the Norman Conquest. They taught writing and illumination as well as psalmody wherever they established monasteries, in England as well as on the Continent of Europe. The relation between rhythmic speech and the "divine art" was strikingly evident in the schools of music and the spirit of the bardic compositions which Giraldus Cambrensis found on his sinister visit to Ireland preparatory to the Norman invasion. He is found bestowing praises in the highest terms on the musical gifts of the Irish. "This people," he says, "deserves to be praised for their successful cultivation of instrumental music, in which their skill is, beyond comparison, superior to that of every nation we have seen. For their modulation is not

drawling and morose like our instrumental music in Britain, but the strains, while they are lively and rapid, are also sweet and delightful. It is astonishing how the proportionate time of the music is preserved, notwithstanding such impetuous rapidity of the fingers; and how, without violating a single rule of the art in running through shakes and slurs, and variously intertwined organizing, or counterpoint, with so sweet a rapidity, so unequal an equality of time, so apparently discordant a concord of sounds, the melody is harmonized and rendered perfect," etc.

The Irish music of the bardic period is acknowledged by several Italian masters in poetry and melody to have inspired the Italian school of the sixteenth century—Tassoni and Gesualdo for instance; and Geminiani, who resided long in Ireland and was a great admirer and friend of Carolan, the last of the race of great minstrels. With brute heel, however, the English of the Elizabethan and Cromwellian eras crushed out the Irish music, because the harp was the fire that fed the flame of Irish patriotism; and with the music the language was doomed to destruction. It was accused of being "barbarous" by the Elizabethan writers and yet it was only a little before their time that an Irish prince, well versed in languages himself, Shane O'Neill, declared that he "could not get his tongue around the barbarous English." Certainly, whatever else may be claimed for "the language of Shakespeare," euphonious construction and scientific arrangement have little place in it.

When the English language arrived in Ireland it looked in the face of the native Gaelic and recognized it at once as its natural enemy. The Irish was a language of the soul: a patchwork growth, compact of chippings from many antagonistic blocks—German, French, Latin, Saxon, Welsh, Dutch, and several others—could not feel at ease in the presence of a perfect work of spirit and science, as the native language was. Therefore it was decreed that the perfect thing must go and the jumble take its place. The English tongue was made the vehicle for the introduction and diffusion of the English Reformation.

Cardinal Newman, who was a good Englishman as well as a great scholar and a great writer of his country's language, knew as well as any man what a national language means. In his work on the "Present Position of Catholics in England" he vividly depicted the part which the language of Protestantism had played both in England and Ireland, in one striking passage:

"Certain masters of composition have been the making of the English language, as Milton, Shakespeare, etc.; and as that language is a fact, so is that literature a fact by which it is formed and in

which it lives. National language and literature are what they are, and they cannot be anything else, whether they be good or bad or of a mixed nature; before they are formed we cannot prescribe them, and afterwards we cannot reverse them. We may feel a great repugnance to Milton and Gibbon as men; we may most seriously protest against the spirit which ever lives and the tendency which ever operates, in every page of their writings; but there they are, an integral portion of English literature; we cannot extinguish them, we cannot deny their power, we cannot write a new Milton or a new Gibbon; we cannot expurgate what needs to be exorcised. They are great English authors, each breathing hatred to the Catholic Church in his own way, each a proud and rebellious creature of God, each gifted with incomparable gifts. Whether we will or no, the phraseology and diction of Milton, and the Protestant formularies, etc., have become a portion of the vernacular tongue, the household words of which, perhaps, we little guess the origin, and the very idioms of our familiar conversation. The man in the comedy "spoke prose without knowing it," and we Catholics, without consciousness and without offence, are ever repeating the half sentences of dissolute playwrights and heretical partisans and preachers. While the English language was coming to the birth, with its special attributes of nerve simplicity and vigor at its very first breathings, Protestantism was at hand to form it upon its own theological *patois*, and to make it the mouthpiece of its own tradition. Protestantism is the intellectual basis, Protestant institutions are the informing objects of English literature. What was wanting to lead the national mind a willing captive to the pretensions of Protestantism beyond the fascination of genius so manifold and so various? The phrases and sentiments of Milton and Bunyan are the household words of the nation; they have become its interpreters of Scripture, and, I may say, its prophets—such is the magical eloquence of their compositions. All English classics go upon the assumption that Protestantism is synonymous with good sense, and Catholicism with weakness of mind, fanaticism, or some unaccountable persuasion or fancy. Verse and prose, grave and gay, the scientific and the practical, history and fable, all is animated spontaneously or imperiously subdued by the spirits of Henry and Elizabeth. Into its very vocabulary Protestantism enters."

The spirit of the Catholic religion is, on the contrary, the informing power of the Irish language. The Irish mind is nothing if not reverent, and poet and musician mostly wrote as if he wrote in the presence of a beneficent God: doubt on that point never occurred to his mind. Irish conversation was and still is redolent of

this tremendous difference in essence. It is full of affectionate veneration and kindly Christian fraternalism.

It was mainly through the interest aroused by Irish music, it would seem, that interest in the Irish language and literature began to be taken by men of learning. The collections of Irish minstrelsy made by Hardiman, Petrie, Bunting and other enthusiasts excited much interest among musicians about the time when Moore began to write melodies to be adapted to the old Irish airs and sing them in the drawing rooms of the great. An important step forward was taken when, in the year 1795, the Royal Irish Academy was founded in Dublin. The objects of this institution were stated to be the study of the science, polite literature, and antiquities of Ireland. The men to whose hands its destinies were at first intrusted were notoriously so unfit for its work that the antagonism of genuine Irish scholars was at once aroused. To this sentiment the Gaelic world owed the appearance of some intellectual giants—John O'Donovan, Eugene O'Curry, Owen Connellan, and several others. Of this brilliant group John O'Donovan was facile princeps, as to range of erudition, capacity for scholarly labor, keenness of observation, and painstaking accuracy. It was the richness of the treasures gathered by O'Curry for his "Manuscript Materials of Irish History" that gave the first considerable impetus to the wave that has ever since his day kept rolling in the intellectual sea and is now sweeping over a vast surface, gathering in all the spirit and genius of the people as it rolls on.

John O'Donovan was born in the County Kilkenny in the year 1806. It was a time when there was a stirring of the dry bones of political and literary achievement among the people, consequent, on the relaxation of the severer penal laws and the aspirations for nationhood, quenched in blood in two insurrections, but only to spring phoenix-like into renewed being at the trumpet-call of O'Connell. Gaelic was at the time very widely spoken outside Dublin, especially in the rural districts. O'Donovan was brought up among the farming population, and he grew up with a mind filled with the folk-lore of the Irish peasantry and the wild sweet music of the Irish peasantry. He was sent to a classical school, after he had mastered the rudiments of learning. At the age of nine he began to study Irish grammatically conjointly with Latin, and so rapid was his progress that after two years' hard work in this field he could translate Irish poetry with facility. His scientific mastery of the language was soon complete, and he devoted his youthful energies to an exposition of the follies of the school of foreigners—Vallancey, Betham, and others—who were in control of the Royal Irish Aca-

demy, and beginning the task of the Irish revival at the wrong end. Like several other men of genius—Mangan, Petrie, and a few more—young O'Donovan found an opening for his peculiar talents at a desk in the Ordnance Survey Office in Dublin. This Ordnance Survey covered a very wide field of measurement and investigation. It embraced inquiries into history, tribal affiliations, nomenclature, ancient and modern, geological diversities, and several other branches of research. While at work in this office O'Donovan made a copy of O'Connell's Irish Dictionary, the MS. of which is in the possession of Trinity College, Dublin. His next literary undertaking was more ambitious: it was a translation of King Alfred's Irish poems; and this was speedily followed by a translation of the Charter of Newry, which demanded great exactitude in phraseology and thorough acquaintance with obsolete as well as existing formularies and conditions. The Ordnance Survey about this time established an Historical Department; and O'Donovan was found to be the man most suitably equipped for the fulfilment of the onerous duties. He was constantly engaged in the work of this establishment from 1830 till 1842, when the Government withdrew the miserable grant it had allowed for it, and the work had to be dropped. Its duties were largely outdoor, and they brought him into all the counties of Ireland on a tour of investigation and verification of localities, families, tribes, settlements, and dialects, such as never had been any man's lot before. His Survey Letters occupy 103 volumes. They are in the custody of the Royal Irish Academy. As a monument of encyclopædic lore they are unique. The antiquities, the legends, the pedigrees, the traditions, the customs past and then present of the localities and the people of the thirty-two counties, are all carefully noted in the marvellous work. The stupendous character of the task may to some extent be guessed at when it is stated that he investigated the spelling and etymology of no fewer than 62,000 Irish townlands and 144,000 proper names on the various maps which passed under his hands. In quite a different field, that of the ancient Irish Sagas, he laid the foundation of that splendid body of literature which has been raised up by the labors of many enthusiastic scholars, foreign as well as Irish, since he first broke the sod in a long forgotten field.

Another monumental work of O'Donovan's was his translation of the Annals of the Four Masters. This was the most complete historical work on Ireland that ever saw the light, but it was dry and uninteresting as to style—more a chronology, in fact, than a literary performance, as so great a theme demanded. The holograph copy of the Annals from which he worked had been procured for

the Royal Irish Academy by George Petrie in the year 1832. O'Donovan recognized it at once as a work in the editing of which he would be enabled to display the best qualities of his scholarship, covering as it did the whole field of Irish history. The work was published by George Smith, a patriotic Dublin publisher, at his own expense, in magnificent style. The first part, for the years 1172 to 1616, appeared in 1848; and the second part, dealing with the earlier period, appeared in 1851. The first part won for him the Cunningham Gold Medal of the Royal Irish Academy, as well as the Honorary LL.D. of Trinity College, and its completion induced the Government to bestow on him a pension of £50 a year. In the meantime he was chosen as Professor of Celtic in the Queen's College, Belfast, which, with the Examinership in Celtic, given him in 1852, made his income from all sources £170 a year—the beggarly monetary reward of a lifetime of enduring work. But his services were retained for Ireland during the remaining years of his life by the establishment of the Brehon Law Commission. Up to the time of his death O'Donovan was engaged on the Brehon Law Tracts. None of them was published during his lifetime, and therefore they all appeared without his revision.

John O'Donovan had several children, some of whom were destined to make a much greater stir in the world, though not to render it as great a service as he. The eldest, Edmund, had a most remarkable and truly romantic career. It may be questioned whether the world had known anything to equal his astonishing adventures since Marco Polo's time. Well educated, at home and in France, he early became a skilled linguist, traveler and litterateur. As war correspondent he traveled much through Turkey and Egypt, picking up a great store of languages and dialects as he moved about from country to country. He wandered from one place to another in Asia until at last he found himself on the borders of the land of mystery called Merv, which is located in the heart of Asia. He lingered by the oasis which is situate on the fringe of the desert, long enough to acquire a knowledge of the language spoken in the strange city, from the mouths of travelers from thence. Then, disguising himself as a Mussulman, he crossed the desert and got access to the city itself—the only European, it is believed, that ever had penetrated beyond its wall. His personality was most magnetic, his manner frank and engaging. He speedily got into good graces with everybody with whom he came into contact, and the Emir of Merv having died, the people unanimously called upon the agreeable stranger to take his place. He acted as Emir for a couple of years. When he returned to Europe he wrote a book on Merv and its

people, the first authentic information on the subject that the Western world had. His portrait, in the magnificent robes of his high office, was presented in the book; it is now probably out of print. A younger brother, Richard, possesses, or did some twenty years ago possess, the Oriental paraphernalia which Edmund brought from Merv. Edmund was not long inactive. His restless spirit impelled him to go to the Soudan to assist Gordon Pasha in putting down the Mahdi. He was joined in Rome, en route for Egypt, by Vizatelli, the artist of "The Illustrated London News," and by Frank Power, a journalist who had been in the Austrian and Turkish armies. All three fell into the ambush that was laid for Hicks Pasha's force, but Power escaped, only to fall later on, when Khartoum was taken by the Mahdi's dervishes, as he was making his way down the Nile. Another brother of the O'Donovans, William, was a clever journalist and literary man, who spent several years on the New York press, but died in obscurity. Another brother, Henry, was also a journalist, and acted as war correspondent in Spain during the last Carlist uprising. He was taken by the royalist forces, and he would have been shot on the charge of being a spy were it not for the interposition of Cardinal Cullen, who was acquainted with the O'Donovan family and knew how absurd was the accusation against Henry.

Edward O'Reilly was for a time a contemporary and co-laborer with O'Donovan in the Irish field. He was the author of a fine Irish-English Dictionary, republished by Duffy in 1864. He was also an archaeologist of rare erudition. Amongst the valuable discoveries which resulted from his patient investigations were the original grants to the Franciscans in Dublin. He wrote:

"The present Roman Catholic Church of the parish of St. Nicholas Without the Walls of Dublin stands on the site of the ancient monastery of the Franciscans, from which Francis street derives its name. It is uncertain at what period the present church was erected, but there can be no doubt that the old building which very lately stood at the northwest angle of the church, and was used for the residence of the Roman Catholic parochial clergy, was part of the cloisters of the old monastery. This was one of the earliest establishments of the Franciscans in Ireland, and was built A. D. 1235 upon a piece of ground granted for that purpose by Ralph le Porter. King Henry III. encouraged the establishment of the Franciscans in Ireland, and on October 8, 1236, a *liberate* was issued for the payment of ten marks to forward the building of their convent in the suburbs of Dublin. At the suppression of the abbeys, etc., by that brutal tyrant Henry VIII., the site of this monastery, with four

messuages and three gardens in Francis street, six acres of meadow near Clondalkin, and all its messuages, gardens, lands, etc., at Boher-na-breena, near Glassnamuckey, were granted for ever to Thomas Stephens, to be held in *Capite* at the annual rent of two shillings Irish money."

Eugene O'Curry was another of the early Titans in the Gaelic revival. He came from Clare, having been born in Danaha, in that county, in the year 1796. His father was a man of refined literary and antiquarian tastes, and possessed a rare knowledge of Irish traditions. Moreover, he owned many old manuscripts in Gaelic on folk-lore. These facts account easily for the taste for Irish studies which Eugene soon developed. He early got acquainted with Mr. George Smith, the patriotic Dublin publisher, and soon got an appointment to join O'Donovan in the work of deciphering the mass of Irish MS. materials both in Trinity College Library and in the Royal Irish Academy under the direction of Dr. George Petrie and Dr. Todd. His work is only secondary in importance to that of O'Donovan. The collection as now printed is called "Manuscript Materials of Irish History." It was originally given in the shape of lectures, delivered while he was professor of Irish history at the Catholic University in Dublin. He also translated the oldest portion of the Annals of the Four Masters. He died in Dublin in 1862, and a large portion of his works were published by the late Dr. W. K. Sullivan, of the Cork Queen's College, in 1873.

While those talented pioneers were thus engaged in blazing the way for a revival of Irish learning worthy of a great cause others less prominent were doing work no less useful, though not so glittering. A Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language was begun in a small way at a little hall in Lower Abbey street, Dublin, with the formation of a class in Irish by Mr. O'Longan, the Irish Scribe of the Royal Irish Academy; Mr. J. J. McSweeney, the Secretary of the Academy, and a few others. Mr. John Fleming, a splendid Irish scholar and school teacher, soon joined in the good work, and the little society began the publication of a periodical in the Irish language called "The Gaelic Journal," which printed lessons as well as general topics of interest to the new movement. Sir Samuel Ferguson, the gifted poet, was president of the Royal Irish Academy at the time, and he gave generous encouragement to the young Gaels; as did also the great scholar and historian, the late Sir John Gilbert. The Rev. Maxwell Close, a non-Catholic clergyman, was also an ardent supporter of the movement by purse as well as pen. Several distinguished German and French scholars were constant visitors to the Royal Irish Academy at that period. Their

interest was awakened by the reports they had heard of the literary treasures possessed by the Academy from Professor Zeuss, the author of an Irish Grammar, and Professor Roehrig, a German Mezzofanti in polyglot powers, but Mezzofanti's superior in scientific analyses of languages.

Professor Roehrig was a wholehearted lover of the Gaelic literature. He says of it:

"In all the beautiful Irish songs and poems, stories and romances, we meet with a truly wonderful productiveness and originality and a most surprising power of invention, such as we find in the Oriental tales, which, for so long a time, were the delight of the whole Western World. In lyric poetry, the Irish literature has evinced, and always maintained, an astonishing superiority. We find, in the Irish historians, mention of works—written even in Pagan times, in Ireland; and of these the most famous was the *Saltair of Tara*, a work which has not come down to us, but is described as having been a complete collection of metrical essays and dissertations on the laws and usages of Ireland. Its author is said to have been Cormac Mac Airt, King of Ireland (from 227 to 226 A. D.). We have ever so many important and valuable works, either in manuscript or print, dating from various periods of time, more or less ancient and remote."

Inasmuch as Professor Mahaffy and other pro-English writers have derided the ancient Irish literature as, amongst other faults, being disfigured by immoral allusions, we may properly quote what Professor Roehrig says on this important point:

"The Brehon Code must impress us favorably by the refinement of its morals, as well as by the skill and ingenuity which are evinced in the discussion of the cases, the nicety of distinction, and the accuracy of definition and classification. Its judgments and penalties are, to a great extent, mild and humane; and in regard to various points, a somewhat considerable latitude seems to be allowed. Some laws relating to damages done to or by animals, etc., remind us of some more or less analogous regulations in the Jewish 'Mishna.' There exists also a remarkable analogy with the Laws of Manu and the legal customs of the Hindoos; not only in regard to fines, but particularly to the 'fasting,' in certain cases, where the contending parties would go before the residence of the defendant and wait there without food for some time. This corresponds, in a measure, to the *dherna*, which was commonly resorted to by the creditors in Hindustan, when they went to sit at the door of the debtor, rigorously abstaining from all food, and threatening to commit suicide

by starvation; intending, thereby, to compel the debtor to return a loan or fulfil his obligations towards the claimant."

Professor Zimmer was another ardent Gaelic student; so too was Professor d'Arbois de Jubainville. It was the present writer's privilege to meet most of these zealous seekers after ancient Irish glories in the halls of the Academy more than once, in the days when the Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language was struggling to let the world know the beauties of the early Irish poems and Sagas, by the help of cheap popular editions of the originals and translations. That good work is continued by the same indefatigable society to the present day, although its name is rarely mentioned, at least on this side of the ocean. The Gaelic League was started by a few impulsive members of the parent society, who believed that the work was not being pushed fast enough; and it has since remained in the field, giving strong help and creating much enthusiasm and arousing much patriotic spirit among the people, as well as injecting a fine moral fibre into the movement, to the social betterment of many backward portions of the country. The late Mr. David Comyn was a distinguished worker in the cause of the League. His translations of Irish literary works were numerous and highly valuable.

These were a few of the noble band who in the early days raised the flag of Irish language and literature from the dust. They are all that space will permit of mention just now; and at future leisure moments it may be possible to go into some details of the work which they all so unselfishly performed. Their successors, under the leadership of Dr. Douglas Hyde and his confreres, have advanced the work they began to the point of almost absolute success; and they deserve the thanks of the Irish nation for it. But the pioneers who had no such encouraging conditions as these have, to cheer them on the way, ought never to be forgotten.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church. Edited by *Charles G. Herbermann, Ph.D., LL.D., Edward A. Pace, Ph.D., D.D., Thomas J. Shahan, D.D., John J. Wynne, S. J., and Conde B. Pallen, Ph.D., LL.D.*, assisted by Numerous Elaborators. In fifteen volumes with Numerous Illustrations and Maps. Volume VII, Greg.—Infal. New York: Robert Appleton Co.

It seems superfluous to say of each volume of the Catholic Encyclopedia as it appears, that it is up to the highest standard in every way, and yet the assertion is not altogether out of place, because it calls attention to a feature of the enterprise that may have passed unnoticed, or that has not been duly emphasized, and it is this: The Catholic Encyclopedia is least of all a commercial enterprise. The learned and self-sacrificing staff of editors have been moved by the love of truth and the desire to make truth known. They have asked for co-operation and help and patronage in order to be able to carry out this purpose, and the result is shown in the faithful manner in which the truth is sought and in which it is set forth.

If this enterprise were chiefly or altogether commercial, we should not expect such sacrifices and should be surprised to find them.

We are sure that nothing could force the editors of the Catholic Encyclopedia to lower their standard except lack of means to keep it up, and we are assured they are beyond that danger.

The present volume almost half completes the work, and exhausts about one-third of the alphabet. The truth is, however, that it disposes of about one-half of its subjects, because the early letters of the alphabet are much more prolific than the later ones—that is, considering them as groups.

Glancing over this volume, certain striking features of the work stand out. For instance, the histories of religious orders are so well written and so complete that they will make a very useful book if they are gathered together into one volume. We do not know any other source from which the valuable historical information contained in these articles could be gotten.

The same could be said of the histories of dioceses, if the writing of them had been entrusted in each case to the man in the diocese best fitted for the work; but unfortunately that has not been done always. Some of these articles are prepared by persons alto-

gether out of touch and out of sympathy with the subject, and the result is dry sketches made from directories and files of local newspapers, in a routine way. Where the opposite course is pursued, and especially in the history of later dioceses, when a writer is employed who has a personal knowledge of affairs almost from the beginning, we get a living sketch full of interest and value. No doubt the editors have recognized this, but may find difficulty in securing the writers.

Another feature of the work which is worthy of notice, and which the present volume brings to our attention in a striking manner, is its dogmatic articles. They are unusually well written, and they are splendid examples of compendium writing. For instance, we find before us such subjects as "Heaven," "Hell," "Immaculate Conception," "Indulgences" and "Infallibility," all treated so briefly, so clearly, and yet so comprehensively, that they could be used equally well before a class of theological students or before a congregation. An illustration of how the Encyclopedia touches extremes is shown in the papers on the "Indians" and on the "Hungarians." In the first we have a very complete history of the old inhabitants of this country going out, and in the second the history of the largest class of new inhabitants coming in.

The up-to-dateness of the book is shown in the sketch of Joel Chandler Harris, who was a convert to the faith and who died recently.

In connection with the labor troubles and strikes, which have become much more frequent recently, all parties concerned might read with profit the excellent paper on "Guilds."

If a glance at a book can bring to view so much that is interesting, what a storehouse of good things awaits the patient reader. These volumes are so attractive that invariably when they are taken up for consultation on one point, they fascinate the reader and tempt him to venture into other fields.

LA VALEUR SOCIALE DE L'EVANGILE, par *L. Garriguet*. Paris: Bloud et Cie., 1910.

In an age in which the instinct of solidarity and the passion of sociality have so strongly asserted themselves as they have in this our day, it may seem strange that the social teachings of the Gospels have received so little consideration. True, indeed, the fundamental principles of the New Testament have not gone without their morally social application to human life. This has been given them full often by preacher and by writer. But the thorough, systematic

study of the social doctrines of our Lord has been left to comparatively recent times. Moreover, that study has been cultivated more extensively by non-Catholic than by Catholic truth-seekers. We can hardly say that we have in English the parallel of Professor Peabody's *Jesus Christ and the Social Question* (Macmillan Co., 1900), a book which M. Garriguet recognizes to have been written "*avec une grande bonnefoi et un sentiment Chrétien très élevé,*" even though it calls in view of Professor Peabody's Unitarianism *sur certains points de sérieuses réserves.*

Seeing, then, this paucity of works, especially Catholic works, of the kind, there should be a welcome for the present book by the well-known writer on economics and sociology, M. Garriguet. A few words on the general scope of the work may help to anticipate and possibly to extend that welcome. Over against the social reform, which is avowedly revolution, proposed by Socialists, Catholic reforms are enlisted in a crusade based on Christian principles and ideals; and they claim to find those principles and ideals in the teachings of Christ and the social traditions of the Church. To the establishment of this claim and the unfolding of its implications the substance of the volume is devoted. During the past five decades countless plans for social betterment have been proposed. Some would build the new State on purely non-moral foundations; religion would either be abolished or would be tolerated as a private individual concern. The social question is exclusively economic, not ethical. Some theorists, on the other hand, while recognizing a moral, and even a dominantly moral, side to the problem, divorce morality entirely from religion and metaphysics. They build on independent ethics. Such an ethic, however, as M. Garriguet demonstrates is devoid of "a human basis," and cannot therefore be itself a stable foundation for a solid superstructure of social remedial theory. It can have no hold on the masses, and even when bolstered up by evolutionism, solidarism and the other fictitious supports, collapsed. Morality in theory as well as practice must be founded on God and religion. The loosening of the moral bonds in modern society runs apace with the weakening of religious belief amongst the people. "To moralize the proletariat," and to render it capable of advancing towards the destiny which the future seems to hold in store for it, *il faut revenir à l'évangile*, which alone holds the words of life for all times and circumstances, for time and eternity. These are the general conclusions to which the author's main thesis leads up. Familiar enough, even platitudinous they seem as here stated; but seen in the concrete setting of M. Garriguet's argumentation, they reflect the freshness and vigor of young life. Within the compass

of three hundred short pages he has succeeded in unfolding the ethico-social contents of the Gospel—their bearings especially upon the perfection of the individual, the family, the people, the State—and he has presented them in a method and style that make up the reading as attractive as it is stimulating and instructive.

CHRISTIAN PEDAGOGY; OR, THE INSTRUCTION AND MORAL TRAINING OF YOUTH.
By *Rev. P. A. Halpin*, Professor of Mental Philosophy, St. Angela's College, New Rochelle, N. Y. 8vo, pp. 229. New York, Joseph F. Wagner, 1909.

Although no apology is needed for this excellent book the author offers one in the following words:

The only excuse for a book of this kind is, that it may be a help toward keeping to the fore the old-time saving principles of all education and toward strengthening the legitimate protest against all dangerous encroachment, a protest that should grow louder and more general in these days, when enlightened defenders of these principles are not as numerous nor as well-equipped as they should be in this fight which is so furiously raging around the foundations of civilization.

It may seem exaggeration to identify pedagogy with the security of the Home and the State. But what the mind is imbued with, sooner or later is translated into action. As a man's mind thinks so does his hand act. Everything that has transpired in all past ages, everything, no matter what its nature, is traceable to some thought that dominated the individual, or the republic, or the empire. In fact, without such a thought there would have been no history, and lethargy and monotony would have characterized all human activity in all the years since the beginning of the race.

It is a dangerous thing for man, collectively or individually, to consider views, opinions, maxims—call them what we will—as of no importance in the shaping of a destiny, whether it be that of a prince or a peasant, a hireling or a master, a pupil or a teacher. To the teacher belongs the task of sowing the first seeds of thought. We are not forgetting the home as a factor in the process. The following pages more than once emphasize the high place the family rightfully possesses in the upbringing of the child. The training imparted by parents is completed by the pedagogue.

Such a practical book on so important a subject by an author so unusually well equipped is worthy of a very warm reception. It is especially important because false theories of education are so prevalent at the present time, and are so widely accepted and followed. Father Halpin's many years of actual work in the class room have

given him a knowledge and experience that fit him to produce the best practical guide for parent and teacher.

He treats of the school, the human soul, the human body, the senses, the brain, the imagination, mental operations, the memory and the will, in a manner that is not only clear and informing, but at the same time charming. Parent and teacher may safely and profitably follow this guide.

DIE FREIHEIT DER WISSENSCHAFT. Ein Gang durch das moderne Geistesleben. Von *Dr. Joseph Donat, S. J.* Innsbruck, Fel. Rauch (Pustet & Co., New York). 1910. Pr. \$1.50.

The fundamental sophism is that of equivocation—ambiguity in language responding to confusion of ideas referred erroneously to the objective order. From this deception regarding what is real and true result very many, if not most of, the evils that play havoc in the moral and social as well as mental and physical life of men, individual and collective. Of all equivocations, ambiguities of speech answering to confusion of ideas, none is so widespread, none has done such mischief to man, as that which sports with the term and the concept of liberty, freedom. In the name of nothing else have so many crimes been committed, so many minds and souls plunged into ruin. On the other hand, books not a few have been written with the endeavor on the part of their authors to secure accurate and uniform thinking on the true significance of liberty. In the work above introduced, a professor at the University of Innsbruck gives us the results of much thought and research in the same direction. He confines himself, however, to one department of the general subject—that is, to freedom of science. Science is essentially intellectual life, and, like all life, must be “free,” but free in what sense? Art also should be “free”—that is, not enslaved to the tyranny of caprice or fashion—but it must be restrained by the laws of beauty and the rules of expression. The citizen rightly demands “liberty”—that is, freedom from the arbitrary abuse of civil authority, but not from the just application of the laws of the State. So, too, of course, the intellect must be free, but not from the restrictions of truth. All this is patent enough. It is only when we come to determine the grounds and the limits of these restrictions in the concrete that difficulties arise and opinions first diverge and then converge in conflict. Professor Donat takes a very comprehensive view of the subject. The freedom of science and its philosophical presuppositions, freedom of research in respect to faith, “liberalistic” freedom of research, freedom of teaching in the domain of morals

and politics, theology and science and the university—the bare mention of these topical headings suggests to the intelligent reader the extent of the ground covered by the volume. But the author's treatment of these large problems is no less profound and thorough. Philosophy, science, history, experience contribute an immense wealth of argument, fact and illustration to the discussion. The spirit of the work is throughout calm and objective—*ruhig und sachlich*, as the author himself calls it. Polemic there is, of course, and not a little; but the animus is impersonal and just, unlikely to offend those who differ from the author's opinions. The style is clear and interesting, though somewhat discursive—*weitläufig*, as the Germans call it. The book might to advantage have been more condensed. However, this fault, if fault it be, is explained by the fact that the volume embodies the author's academic lectures—forms of discourse which are necessarily somewhat diffuse. Moreover, in so difficult and delicate a matter, expansiveness and repetition contribute to ensuring true understanding. The work is a solid contribution to the literature of its subject.

EPITRES DE SAINT PAUL. Lecons d'Exegese par C. Toussaint. Librairie Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie., 117, rue de Rennes, Paris.

A unique interest attaches to St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians. If not the first canonical texts of the New Testament, as modern exegetists usually consider them, they are in all probability the first of the letters addressed by the great apostle to the nascent Christian communities, and they thus not only reveal the early outpourings of his soul for the children whom he had begotten by the Gospel to Christ, but they furnish us with a starting point whence to trace the development of his doctrines as they unfold themselves in his subsequent epistles. Professor Toussaint has thus gained a special interest for his present undertaking by opening it with the exegesis of the Thessalonian letters. Next to them he places the Epistle to the Galatians, then the Epistles to the Corinthians. These constitute the matter of the volume at hand. The other Pauline writings are reserved for a future volume. Let us say a word regarding the scope and spirit of the work. In the first place, it is not simply a new translation—even though made directly from the Greek—with the usual appendage of textual notes and commentaries. Nor is it, in the second place, a manual introductory to and embracing the theology of the Epistles. It is something of both. By probing their contents to their depths, the author has sought to bring out the logical unity of each Epistle. He thus enables the reader to

place himself in personal rapport with St. Paul; to enter into the soul of the great apostle as it poured itself out in thought and love to his beloved disciples.

The reader has, therefore, in Professor Toussaint's volume a key both to the letter and the spirit of the text—a commentary, a treatise and a story which, when he has used, will make him look eagerly for the complementary volume introductory to the other Epistles.

DE SCRIPTURA SACRA. *J.-B. Bainvel*, lector theologiae in Facultate catholica Parisiensi. 1 vol. in-8 de viii-214 pp. Librairie Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie., 117, rue de Rennes, Paris.

Students of Theology are acquainted with Professor Bainvel's tractate *De magisterio vivo et traditione*, published some few years. The present work is built on similar lines; that is, the authoritative documents are first accumulated and the body of theological doctrine developed therefrom. Accordingly the student finds here in the part the "Scripturæ Acta" of Pius X, Leo XIII, the Vatican and Tridentine Councils, and of similar authorities back to Nice. These are followed by the Scholastic, Patristic and Biblical teachings, and these in turn by some Jewish and heterodox documents. Here then are the *fontes theologici*. Out of these in the second part of the volume are drawn the theses with their principles and deductions bearing on the subjects of inspiration, inerrancy, the Canon, the Vulgate, exegesis, the use and treatment of Scripture. Difficult and delicate questions bristle in these fields, but the author approaches them with perfect awareness of the gravity of his undertaking, and he handles them firmly but at the same time with tact. His concern is to exhibit the teaching and mind of the Church—to set down what is certain and what uncertain and debatable; to sacrifice no traditional truth, but to omit no new discovery; in a word, to combine sane conservatism with reasonable progressiveness. The book is designed to be a text-book; hence to be used by a competent teacher and an earnest student. Succinctly compacted as it is, both master and pupil must do some work to profit by its use. Upon this condition, however, the book will approve itself. It says *multa, multum, sed non multo*.

70567

PERIODICAL



DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

